

SATURDAY REVIEW

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 591, Vol. 23.

February 23, 1867.

Price 6d.
Stamped 7d.

THE MINISTRY AND REFORM.

THE week that has passed has brought us little new on the one absorbing topic of public interest. Reform is very much where it was seven days ago. All that has happened, with the exception of a conversation in the House of Lords, is that, in answer to anxious and eager questioners, Mr. DISRAELI has stated that he is perfectly satisfied with what he has done, and that he thinks he has managed particularly well in dealing with Reform. Schoolboys used to be told, in the spirit of abandoned recklessness too natural to their time of life, to tell a lie and stick to it; and Mr. DISRAELI has modified the maxim, and, accommodating it to the riper wisdom of maturer years, has resolved to say nothing and stick to it. He thinks, or says he thinks, that his explanatory speech was a good explanatory speech, and that his Resolutions were just what they ought to be. He is proud of his perfect blank. He considers it a successful *coup* to have kept the nation three weeks longer in perfect ignorance of the intentions of the Ministry than any one would have supposed it possible to keep it. On Monday next he will, as he owns, be obliged to declare, with some degree of distinctness, what the Cabinet means and wishes; but until next Monday no one shall know. It is true that by doing this he has ascertained something. He has learnt the strength of the Conservative position. It is now more manifest than it ever was that the House wishes the present Government to settle the question, or at least to have a fair chance of settling it, and will pardon almost every possible mistake so that the indulgence thus extended makes the path of Reform smoother. Had this feeling not been so strong, the condemnation of the Ministry for trifling with the House, and deluding the nation, by bringing forward vague, unmeaning Resolutions and abdicating all Ministerial responsibility, would have been as certain as that an apple loosened from its stalk will fall to the earth. But the Ministry is spared because, however weak and divided and self-humiliated it may be on this question of Reform, yet it happens to be very useful. A political partisan like Mr. DISRAELI may see this fact established with great relish and complacency, but if he could but dare to speak his thoughts frankly, he would perhaps acknowledge that this pleasure has its drawbacks. If his party thus proves its present importance, it also loses the respect which it would otherwise gain by its activity and its success in administration. If Mr. DISRAELI himself is for a few days the master of the situation, he at the same time undermines his permanent reputation. He creates the impression that he is not a statesman—not a leader capable of understanding and guiding his country—but merely a clever trickster, a shuffler of the cards, an adroit and an able, but not a wise or patriotic man. The Conservative party is still held in honour, and its possession of power is still thought a political necessity; but its leaders are daily losing in public estimation. Mr. DISRAELI is, of course, primarily to blame; but then his colleagues have submitted to be represented by Mr. DISRAELI.

Next Monday, however, will, it may be hoped, lift the curtain that veils the great secret. We cannot be perfectly sure that even then Mr. DISRAELI will tell us what the Government intends to do. A man who has kept a secret so long may perhaps think he can keep it a little longer. But the probability is that he will then see that delay would involve defeat and ruin, and will disclose something like a policy about Reform, if not a distinct scheme of Reform. At the same time it is idle to affect to ignore the great difficulties with which the Conservative party has to deal in proposing a Reform Bill. Mr. DISRAELI has to think not so much what will be possible with the House as what will be possible with his own supporters. Will they be content to propose a low standard in the borough franchise? If they fix on a high standard, they are sure to be beaten; if they make a virtue of necessity, and propose a low standard, how can

they do so consistently without providing some checks on what they have hitherto thought the evil tendency of a large electoral body? They may perhaps hope that these checks will be provided, but they cannot be sure of this. If they accept a figure for the borough and the county franchise, they will then place themselves and the House exactly in the position to which Mr. GLADSTONE wished to bring the House last Session. If the figures of the franchise were fixed, then, he said, it would be easy to go on and arrange the other provisions of the Bill on the basis of what had been settled. It is true that the present Government propose to go on with their whole measure in the same Session, and this gives their proposal a great superiority over that of Lord RUSSELL's Government. But this does not remove, although it lessens, the difficulty. It always must be exceedingly hard to deal with Reform except as a whole. The settlement of the redistribution of seats must affect the settlement of the franchise. Household suffrage may work very well if this redistribution is well-managed, and very badly if this redistribution is ill-managed. The figure of the county franchise may be fixed higher or lower according as the number of county members is not or is to be largely increased. It may be conceded perhaps that 160 county members shall be elected on a 20*l.* rating franchise; but it does not follow that 200 county members ought to be elected on a franchise fixed at so high a point. Then, again, the figures of the franchise may give satisfaction or not, according as the concession of a large extension is or is not coupled with counterpoises of an irritating kind. If the Government concedes a low borough franchise, the Reformers of the Northern towns will be pleased; but if the Government insists on the resolution that the Constitution forbids the predominance of a class, these same men will be furious. For although it is true that no class ought to be predominant, yet it is historically untrue that hitherto no class has been predominant. On the contrary, the classes which the Conservatives more especially represent have been predominant for centuries—not, we will allow, without some benefit to the country. But now that power is, as they think, passing into other hands, they lay down a totally new maxim, good in itself, but specially directed against the class they dread. This creates the feeling that they are behaving in an unhandsome way, and of all impressions they could produce this is the most dangerous to their cause.

The Conservatives, therefore, have a perilous position to occupy and maintain, and unless they will boldly face Reform as a whole, fight only when they have a chance of fighting with advantage, and resolve that if they pass a Reform Bill they shall at least be thanked for passing it, they can scarcely escape a great disaster. If they accept a considerable reduction of the franchise, abandon such counterpoises and checks as may seem to them clever, but would really be irritating, or frivolous, or practically impossible, they may, we are convinced, make the future Parliaments of England far more Conservative than eager Reformers anticipate. The great fear we feel is lest the Conservatives should hereafter be too successful. Not that we wish them to be out of office, or have any objection to their having a party triumph as well as their adversaries; but there is a base, vulgar-minded, reactionary Conservatism, far lower in tone than the Conservatism of the present Conservative party, which may triumph before many years are over, and may corrupt and degrade the party itself. Still, the Conservatives are quite right to struggle for their fair share of political influence, and if they know how to manage their affairs they may easily get it. For if their task is hard, so is that of the Opposition. Mr. GLADSTONE is as uncertain how far he can carry his party as Mr. DISRAELI is. He scarcely knows yet how much he must concede, or on what he may safely insist. Of one thing, however, there can be no doubt. He has gained this Session as much as Mr. DISRAELI has lost, for he has shown himself conciliatory, courteous, and

long-suffering. He has preserved the attitude of a statesman towards Reform, while Mr. DISRAELI has abandoned it for the attitude of a clever manœuvrer, whose cleverness is not very clever. It is a matter of great importance to the country that Mr. GLADSTONE should have shown himself capable of behaving so well at such a crisis, and his conduct in opposition now promises well for his conduct when he comes to hold again the reins of power.

IRELAND.

A FEW days before the introduction of Lord NAAS's Land Bill it could scarcely have been hoped that measures of Irish improvement would at present be discussed in Parliament. The accounts of the disturbance in Kerry, if not alarming, produced general uneasiness, and it was thought necessary that the SECRETARY for IRELAND and the COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF should immediately proceed to their posts. But the enterprise appears to have collapsed before it could be called an insurrection. One policeman was wounded; a few scores or hundreds of armed men marched about a wild district for a day or two, and the respectable inhabitants of Killarney and its neighbourhood were naturally frightened. No simultaneous rising took place in any other part of the island, though the scheme may perhaps have been connected with the crazy project of taking Chester Castle. The Kerry attempt may be useful if it convinces the disaffected peasantry that the Government can, on the shortest notice, pour an overwhelming force into any part of Ireland. The Fenians have lost, at least for the present, the services of two or three leaders, and they have proved that their adherents are not disposed to open rebellion; but, on the other hand, they have found it possible, after creating general alarm, to disperse with perfect impunity. If they found means to send the news of the outbreak to America by the Atlantic cable, it is probable that some politician of the order of Mr. BANKS may by this time have proposed the recognition of the Irish Republic. The rebellion, however, has collapsed so entirely that it will scarcely serve even as a pretext for fiction or exaggeration. It probably originated in the desire of STEPHENS to furnish his followers with some excuse for pretending to believe in his serious designs against England. Having frequently promised that he would be fighting on Irish soil before the end of 1866, he would have been excused for redeeming his pledge at the moderate interval of two months. It remains to be seen whether Fenian mendacity and credulity will, on the other side of the Atlantic, magnify the Cahirciveen adventure into a commencement of civil war. The Government has prudently asked Parliament to prolong for a time the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act; and possibly it may soon lay hands on the principal ringleaders. It would be extremely gratifying to hear that a few American sympathizers were exhibiting their devotion to the cause of Ireland in penal servitude. The Canadians have shown that they are not disposed to regard piratical invasion as a venial indiscretion; and the Irish Government will be supported by universal opinion in punishing with exemplary severity any foreign adventurers who may have endeavoured to organize rebellion. Lord NAAS's statement of the measures of the Government and of the prospects of the conspiracy was received with satisfaction by the House of Commons. The proper jealousy with which exceptional measures of security are regarded is rather an English than an Irish feeling.

Although the Fenians are profoundly indifferent to compensation for agricultural improvements, the tenure of land is indisputably connected with the disaffection which makes chronic conspiracy possible. The unhappy state of society in Ireland is explained partly by historical causes, and in a great degree by past and present over-population. Notwithstanding The O'DONOGHUE's statement that O'CONNELL sometimes complained of the uncertain tenure of the occupiers, Lord NAAS was substantially justified in asserting that the present agitation commenced within less than four-and-twenty years ago. Mr. CORDEN, writing on the grievances of Ireland thirty years ago, never referred to fixity of tenure or to compensation for improvements, and grievances connected with the land were not prominently mixed up with the Repeal agitation. In O'CONNELL's time much Irish land was still subject to long leases, although the cultivators of the soil, whether they held under landlords or under middlemen, were tenants at will. It would have been absurd to urge the extension of the system which had produced the pauper forty-shilling freeholder; nor could O'CONNELL himself have gravely discussed the permanent improvements which had been effected in mud-cabins or on potato-patches. The economical advance of Ireland in con-

sequence of the diminished pressure of population explains and justifies the demand for additional security to the tenant. It is true that dealings in land ought in theory to be matters of compact; but the demand in Ireland is still greater than the supply, and the farmer can only obtain a holding on the customary terms. Lord DUFFERIN has explained the difficulty of beneficial interference; but Parliament has long since decided that the question requires some legislative action. Mr. CARDWELL's Bill has become a dead letter; and, on the other side, it is impossible to make concessions which would amount to a confiscation of the soil.

Without local knowledge it is impossible to judge whether the measure introduced by Lord NAAS will be practically useful. If the tenantry abstain from applying to the Commissioner of Improvement, the principles which are involved in his appointment are of little consequence. Lord NAAS himself is intimately acquainted with the condition of land in Ireland, and some of the Irish members seem inclined to receive the Bill with favour. The large portion of clamour for compensation which really means expropriation of the landowners will not be mitigated by the most equitable arrangement between landlord and tenant. The Ministerial Bill is designed to satisfy genuine demands for equitable compensation, and it seems to be well adapted to the purpose. The provisions of the Acts for encouraging landed improvements are to be extended from the owner to the occupier. Both in Great Britain and Ireland, life tenants, and even wrongful occupants, have for some years past been enabled to charge the land, under certain conditions, with the cost of improvements. So important an innovation has seldom been introduced with so little notice; for the land-improvement Acts repeal, within the scope of their provisions, all the entails and settlements which have placed the greater part of the land of the United Kingdom in a kind of hereditary mortmain. The flagrant evil of giving the actual owner of land an interest adverse to the improvement of his estate has been to a great extent corrected by the modern power of mortgaging the land for the cost of improvements; and Lord NAAS takes a further step by giving the occupying tenant, even if he only holds from year to year, a power of charging the land as against the reversioner. In the public interest it is expedient that land and every other kind of property should be used in the most profitable manner, and to remove the impediments to free development which are interposed by law or custom is one of the most legitimate objects of legislation. The provisions of Lord NAAS's Bill carefully guard the rights of the landlord, while they identify the interests of the tenant with the improvement of the land.

A Commissioner, who will be enabled to avail himself of the machinery of the Improvement Acts, is to be invested with the power of deciding on the expediency of certain classes of improvements. Drainage, fencing and removal of fences, cultivation of wastes, and clearance of stony land, are to be subject to his absolute discretion. If the occupier applies for facilities for these purposes, the Commissioner will exercise his own judgment, and his decision will bind the landlord. To the owner is reserved the right of refusing his consent to the erection of new buildings; but any buildings which the tenant may voluntarily erect are to be removable by him at the expiration of his tenancy, unless the landlord buys them at a valuation. For improvements of the first class, and for buildings erected with the consent of the landlord, money will be advanced, on the Commissioner's recommendation, by the Board of Public Works, and the principal and interest will remain as a charge on the land. Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE seemed to misapprehend the provisions of the Bill when he objected to loans of public money to tenants at will. A lender looks not to the individual borrower, but to the character of the security. A legal mortgage of a freehold is equally valuable whether it has been made by a millionaire or a labouring cottager. The landlord will be secured against unreasonable charges by the enactment which provides that the Commissioner shall only assent where the profit to accrue is likely to exceed the amount of the charge.

The measure would have been incomplete if the occupier had been compelled in all cases to make his improvements with borrowed money. By a considerate and ingenious arrangement the powers of the Commissioner are extended to cases in which the tenant prefers the expenditure of his own money, or even of his own labour. There is no reason why a man should work for the benefit of the reversioner rather than on his own account, if he chooses to drain a field with his own hands instead of raising a loan to pay a labourer. If the plan is sanctioned by the Commissioner, the tenant who

has dispensed with borrowed money will be entitled, on leaving his farm, to receive in a lump sum the value of his improvement, after deduction of the instalments which would have been paid in the interval on a loan contracted for the same purpose. The amount paid to the outgoing tenant will then be charged on the land, as if the money had been in the first instance borrowed. No part of the scheme is more creditable to the Irish SECRETARY and his advisers. The success of the measure will in a great degree depend on the simple and intelligible character of the official forms, and on the efforts which may be made to induce small occupiers to understand the system, and to repose confidence in those by whom it will be administered. That the advantages offered should be generally appreciated is on many grounds desirable. As Lord NAAS fairly suggested, the judgments formed by the Commissioner will be lessons in agricultural improvement, as it will be his duty to disapprove all unprofitable outlay. It is still more important that the Irish tenantry should be convinced that they are justly treated by the Imperial Legislature.

AUSTRIA AND HUNGARY.

ALTHOUGH a policy of incessant oscillation inspires little confidence in the councils of Austria, the latest experiment is the most hopeful which has been tried during the EMPEROR's troubled reign. The inconvenience of recognising the separate rights of Hungary is obvious and great, but the concession provides the only chance of preserving or restoring the greatness of the House of HAPSBURG. The Hungarians are rewarded for their steady determination not to surrender their ancient liberties by the unconditional submission of their KING to their legitimate demands. The formation of a responsible Hungarian Ministry is a more significant event than the promulgation of a dozen newfangled Constitutions. Whatever may become of the rest of the Empire, the Kingdom of Hungary is re-established as an independent State; and unless some equally sudden reaction should follow, King FRANCIS JOSEPH will shortly be crowned, after having evaded the accompanying obligations for nineteen years. The nation is, for the first time in the present generation, enthusiastically loyal; nor could any foreign enemy now hope to profit by internal disaffection. It is not known how far the Slavonic and Rouman subjects of the Hungarian Crown share in the satisfaction of the ruling race; but the Magyar leaders have sufficient political aptitude to understand the necessity of uniting all the inhabitants of the Kingdom by the enjoyment of equal rights. The attempt to govern the population by stimulating internal jealousies proved an utter failure in the early part of the present reign. It was found easier to irritate the Hungarians than to conciliate the Croats. As long as the policy of separation was pursued, the feeling of Hungary to the Austrian Empire strongly resembled the indignation provoked in England when the STUART Kings relied for the support of arbitrary power on the fanaticism or loyalty of the native Irish. The termination of the long-standing quarrel is the more surprising, because it has followed immediately on an abortive attempt at usurpation. Only two or three months have passed since the EMPEROR's Government published, without the assent of the Diet, a decree for remodelling the military system of the Kingdom. The discovery that an extravagant blunder had been committed appears at last to have convinced the EMPEROR of the necessity of yielding to the Hungarian demands. The retirement of Count BELCREDI, and the concentration of Ministerial power in the hands of Baron BEUST, indicate a total revolution in the Austrian system of government.

The process of concession is always easy, nor will the Hungarian Diet be for the present unwilling to reciprocate the liberality of the Crown. The objectionable laws of 1848 will probably be repealed, now that the national honour is satisfied by a formal recognition of their validity. The difficulty remains of reconciling the German and Slavonic provinces of Austria to the division of the Empire. The Government has lost no time in announcing its devotion to constitutional principles on the west as well as on the east of the Leitha; and the Diet, which had been suspended during the negotiations, is once more summoned to represent all parts of the Austrian dominions, except Hungary. A paper Constitution which can be destroyed or revived at the will of the sovereign furnishes but an insufficient security for freedom, and deputies and constituents fully understand the necessary results of the separation of Hungary. A Parliament which represents half a monarchy can scarcely control the policy of the Government.

The Diet has hitherto been almost powerless, because Hungary refused to take part in its deliberations; and the same defect will be perpetuated by the complete establishment of territorial dualism. The aspirations of Bohemia and Galicia to independence will be encouraged by the success of Hungary, and even the German portions of the monarchy will feel that they are reduced to comparative insignificance by their simultaneous exclusion from all influence on Hungarian affairs and from the German Confederation. As a stranger, if not a foreigner, Baron BEUST can exercise no personal influence over Austrian politicians, and he is probably exposed to much jealousy and dislike. His boldness in adopting the only measure which could restore the greatness of the monarchy, will not be fully appreciated by provinces which have steadily opposed all projects of Hungarian independence. His measures will also be the more unpopular from the haste with which they have been adopted and announced.

Some of the ulterior objects of the reconciliation with Hungary may possibly, if they are allowed to transpire, attract sympathy in other portions of the Empire. It is scarcely possible to doubt that the Austrian Minister anticipates the renewal, at no distant period, of the struggle with Prussia. No statesman has suffered more personal or political disappointment from the results of the recent war. During the long disputes on Schleswig and Holstein, Baron BEUST was the most zealous advocate of the rights of the petty German States, and of the privileges of the German Diet. At the London Conference he was allowed to believe himself the organ of national enthusiasm, and he had previously courted German popularity by the cheap device of using discourteous language to the English Government. When he found that he had only been an unconscious instrument in the hands of BISMARCK, he hoped for vengeance by the triumph of the Austrian arms, and as Saxon Minister he induced his Sovereign, alone among the minor princes, to take a vigorous part in the war with Prussia. The political annihilation of the dynasty which he served was followed by his own elevation to a more important post, and the essential unity of the German nation is remarkably illustrated by the promotion of a Saxon subject to the highest political rank in Austria. Count BISMARCK has publicly avowed his expectation that the war will be renewed; and the probability of a future rupture is increased by the additional strength which the Empire will derive from the willing support of Hungary. It is not, however, likely that any dangerous policy will be adopted, until the feelings and intentions of the Western portions of the monarchy have been ascertained by the convocation of the Diet at Vienna. Appeals to patriotism are tentative and doubtful where there may possibly be a double or divided allegiance. The German provinces of Austria are attracted towards the Federal body to which they recently belonged, and perhaps they may be repelled from a Court which has shown its disposition to rely on an alien community. The Galicians, who were lately the most loyal subjects of the Austrian Crown, will regard with suspicion Baron BEUST's overtures to Russia in his Circular on the Eastern question. It seems not improbable that the Austrian proposal to modify the terms of the Treaty of 1856, may be designed to purchase a discontinuance of intrigues with the Ruthenian population. It may possibly be prudent to cultivate friendship at home and abroad, with a view to a future contest with Prussia; but in domestic and foreign combinations it is extremely difficult for Austria to form an alliance without provoking a corresponding enmity.

Notwithstanding the complex difficulties of Austrian policy, the Minister has chosen the safer course in acknowledging the constitutional rights of Hungary. The disaffection in the other dominions of the EMPEROR may by prudence and good fortune be diminished or overcome, but the dispute with Hungary admitted of only one solution. Claims of established right produce a definite issue between law and arbitrary power. During the administration of SCHWARZENBERG the Austrian Government maintained, like the extreme Republicans of the United States, the doctrine that a territory recovered by force in a civil war is thenceforth held by the mere right of conquest, and that the ownership is discharged of all constitutional incumbrances. This simple and intelligible theory prevailed until the Italian war made it necessary to apply to Hungary for active support. From that time to the present, successive Austrian Ministers have been vainly endeavouring to effect an impossible compromise. The Hungarians were offered Parliamentary representation at Vienna, with all other franchises of the modern pattern; but they were told that a Ministry responsible to their own Diet would be absolutely incompatible with the existence of the monarchy. Although no

active resistance was offered to the provisional exercise of irregular power, the Austrian Government was reminded on suitable occasions that all its acts in Hungary were illegal, and that the KING himself could only enter into full possession of his dignity by taking the oaths which are preliminary to the form of coronation. Unless fresh violations of the compact between the Crown and the people are perpetrated, the EMPEROR may henceforth count on the loyalty of one important section of his dominions. If his submission to necessity causes additional difficulty in dealing with his German subjects, the inconvenience which may ensue was, sooner or later, inevitable. In negotiations with the various provinces, the Austrian Government will have the advantage of standing on the solid ground of a rightful and universally recognised title to the allegiance of Hungary.

PLURALITY OF VOTES.

THE Resolutions proposed by Mr. DISRAELI contain scarcely any indication of the kind of Bill which would please his party except the proposition that "the principle of plurality of votes, if adopted by Parliament, would facilitate the settlement of the borough franchise on an extensive basis." For the exact meaning and the exact degree of importance which the Government attaches to this Resolution we must wait till Monday next; but there happen to be general considerations affecting the proposal to give a plurality of votes in borough elections which are quite independent of the intentions or views or policy of any particular Ministry. This question may, fortunately, be discussed entirely apart from all reference to party. It is true that the Conservatives have now laid down the doctrine that such a mode of voting would be desirable, but they have laid it down in a very timid way, and Mr. DISRAELI entirely omitted to give it any support or countenance in his speech of last week. It cannot be considered, therefore, as any blow to the Conservative party if the proposal is rejected; and if it is quite clear, and capable of full demonstration, that this mode of voting is totally impossible in borough elections, it is very desirable that the Conservative party should see this in time, and should not waste their strength in fighting on a ground where they are quite certain to be beaten. The argument against plurality of voting seems to us so conclusive, when the question is examined dispassionately, that we are convinced that those who see in this mode of voting a prop against democracy are leaning on a rotten reed. That the Conservatives, at this great crisis of the history of their party, should not lean on rotten reeds, but should rely on effective props and supports, is as necessary for themselves as it is important to the country at large.

Plurality of votes may mean one of two things. It may mean that one voter has more votes than another because he is worth more in some way, or it may mean that every voter shall be able to give the votes he possesses to one or more of the candidates, as he pleases. In the latter case, the expression is not very accurate; but we will suppose that the Resolution embraces both methods of voting. It is, however, obvious, from the wording of the Resolution, and is attested by much external evidence, that what the Government meant was to recommend that an elector who is richer than another elector should, within certain limits, have more electoral power than his poorer neighbour. The object of this is, of course, to give wealth and education and respectability some chance in their contest with the swarming numbers of the poor, the ignorant, and the reckless. And the scheme is supposed to have the justification of the precedent obtaining in certain municipal elections; and further, to be based on the general principle that the primary duty of the English House of Commons is to provide taxation, and that a man who pays more taxes than another ought to have more to do with settling what taxes shall be levied and how they shall be collected. In answer to this it may, we think, be fairly objected, that the little the poor man pays in taxes falls more heavily perhaps on him than the larger sum contributed to the State by his richer neighbour, and, still more, that the English House of Commons has in these days got very many other things to do besides settling taxation. It has to govern a great nation, with its various and complicated interests, and the degree in which the interests of each man are affected by the kind of government adopted cannot be reduced to a pecuniary standard. A man who lives in a 20*l.* house may pay twice as much in taxes as a man who lives in a 10*l.* house, but he cannot be said to be twice as much interested in the good administration of Jamaica. But, apart from this general reasoning, the

scheme for giving plurality of votes according to wealth would break down in details. If the proposal is put in the very modest and inoffensive shape in which it has appeared in some Conservative journals—if, in fact, the whole sting is taken out of it, and it is to mean nothing more than that a man occupying a house rated at 30*l.* shall have two votes—it is ridiculous to think that the very small number of votes thus gained in the interests of wealth and education would stem the tide of democracy. They would place a few individuals in an invidious position, but that would be all. If, on the other hand, the proposal were carried out in a bold and free way—if, for example, the 10*l.* householder were allowed two votes, the 15*l.* householder three votes, and so on—the effect would be considerable, but the scheme would be practically impossible. The whole case for a Reform Bill rests on the alleged fact that there are persons too poor to live in a 10*l.* house who are exactly as well qualified to take part in elections as the 10*l.* householder. It is out of the question to suppose that the persons thus excluded now, but who have been promised by the leaders of all parties that they shall be included soon in the electoral body, will be content with a provision that they shall be entrusted with exactly half the power given to the 10*l.* householders whose superiority to themselves they have so persistently and so successfully denied. Plurality of votes, therefore, in this sense, must be given up; and we believe that the Conservative leaders are now quite aware that it must be given up. We shall hear little, if anything, more of giving more votes to the rich man than to the poor man.

But there are persons who consider that it is not the rich minority, as such, which ought to be protected, but that all minorities ought to be protected, and that this may be done by a new arrangement of votes. Sometimes it is proposed that every elector shall have only one vote, and sometimes that every elector shall, as at present, have as many votes as there are members to be returned for his borough or county, but that he shall be allowed to give all his votes to any one candidate. It seems strange, at first sight, to group these proposals together as schemes for allowing a plurality of votes; but they may be grouped together, because there is really no difference in the effect they would produce. It makes no difference whether every man has one vote or two votes or three votes to do as he pleases with, provided he may give all he has to one candidate. If there are, in a borough returning two members, 600 Liberals and 301 Conservatives, the Conservative candidate will be returned, whether each elector can give one or two votes, so long as, if the Conservatives have two votes, they may give both to their candidate. The question is, therefore, simply whether this cumulation of votes is desirable, and we think it is clearly not. In the first place, in all boroughs returning one member the principle is wholly inapplicable. There the majority must decide, and the minority is helpless. And it must be remembered that the number of boroughs returning one member is likely to be greatly increased, for the simplest way of getting seats for the large towns of the North is to take away the second member from small towns of the South; and the Northern boroughs created, and the Southern boroughs left standing, will thus be in a very large measure boroughs to which this cumulative voting cannot apply. In all boroughs returning two members it could of course be made to apply, but it would be unfair and injurious that it should apply. If a borough returns two members, and there are 600 Liberal electors and 301 Conservative electors, and all vote, the borough would be certain, under the system of cumulative voting, to return one Liberal and one Conservative. This is not to represent the minority; it is to give 301 electors as much power as 600, which is quite absurd if majorities mean anything at all. Why should the 600 Liberal electors be debarred from exercising any influence over the Legislature because a minority, so clearly and incontestably a minority, happens to disagree with them? It is said that it is equally absurd that two Liberals should represent a constituency more than one-third of which is Conservative, and that under the present system the minority is quite disregarded and unrepresented. It is unrepresented exactly as it is unrepresented in boroughs returning a single member. And the second member is given, not to represent the minority, but to represent the importance of the constituency. Where parties are nearly equal, there is at present always a fair chance of the minority getting the second seat. If there were 600 Liberals in a borough, and 550 Conservatives, the second member would often be a Conservative, merely because local influence might easily tell. The Conservative might be popular or powerful; he might be a nobleman, or a brewer, or a philanthropist. That is, the

opinion of the borough would really be divided, and the election would represent this division. But that 301 Conservatives should be able to divide the representation as a matter of course with 600 Liberals, is totally inconsistent with the fundamental theory of English politics, that the majority has a right to bind the minority. If it happened that there were 600 Liberals and 299 Conservatives, then, under the principle of cumulative voting, the Liberals would return two members, and the 299 Conservatives would be unrepresented. There is no sense in this. If a Liberal majority can represent or eclipse 299 Conservatives, it may be trusted to do as much for 301.

There are no boroughs with three members, and the Ministerial proposal only extends to boroughs; but boroughs with three members might certainly be created. There is, however, a preliminary objection to this; for the boroughs that could be accommodated with three members are very few indeed—perhaps not above half a dozen in all England, putting aside the metropolitan constituencies. To stem the tide of democracy with six members is ludicrous. It might be a good thing, or it might not, that Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Bristol, and one or two other towns, should have a third member; but democracy would not be much affected one way or the other. The objection, however, to giving a plurality of votes when there are three members is as great as it is when there are two. If in a borough returning three members there are (to retain the same figures) 600 Liberals, and every elector has three votes, then, under the system of cumulative voting, 201 Conservatives will be able to return a member, but 199 will not be able. If the constituency be of such importance that its voice in the Legislature is represented by three members, why should one-quarter of the constituency be able to say that the other three-quarters shall have only one clear vote in Parliament at their disposal? The system once proposed by Lord RUSSELL, of giving, not a plurality of cumulative votes, but two votes only to each elector when there were three seats, and not allowing cumulation, had the advantage of making the minority which could command a seat much larger than the system of cumulation does. Under the system of allowing only two votes the Conservative minority must be 401 in order to secure one seat out of three with 600 Liberals against them; whereas, under the cumulative system, the minority need only be 201. It would be better, therefore, to revert to Lord RUSSELL's plan if minorities are to be represented. But no contrivances for the representation of minorities by giving this or that number of votes in local elections can be effectual. Logically, the notion of representing minorities cannot stop short of the point to which Mr. MILL has carried it. Under his plan of what he calls personal representation, minorities would be really represented; and if the objections to his plan are practically overwhelming, contrivances for the direct representation of minorities may be regarded as hopeless. As Mr. DISRAELI well observed once, the true way for a minority to be represented is to become the majority. At the same time, however, it will be well to consider whether there may not be other and simpler modes of securing to property and intelligence their due weight in the representation, so that, in the language of the Speech from the Throne, the elective franchise may be freely extended "without unduly disturbing the balance of political power."

ADMIRALTY REFORM.

MR. SEELY may be congratulated on having achieved a triumph of which no other naval reformer can boast. He has extracted from the representative of the Admiralty in the House of Commons an honest and candid speech. To some extent Mr. SEELY's good fortune may be ascribed to circumstances over which he had no control. If the First Lord for the time being had been shrouded in the thick darkness of the House of Lords, and had spoken only through the medium of an ingenious Secretary like Lord CLARENCE PAGET, no amount of evidence would have sufficed to obtain the frank acknowledgment given by Sir JOHN PAKINGTON that the Board of Admiralty is a clumsy piece of machinery, inconvenient and not profitable to the public service, and still less to extract the promise which he added to do his best to effect a change in this long-condemned system. In justice to Sir JOHN PAKINGTON, it is only right to add that his language when in office has always been frankness itself when compared with the dodges which have ordinarily distinguished the tactics of the Admiralty. But even Sir JOHN PAKINGTON will

not be the worse for the reminder that it is much easier to speak honest words than to do honest acts, and that, unless the promises he has held out shall be fulfilled by a thorough reform of the worst of our departmental organizations, he will sink into a position not very different from that of his predecessors, who, with charming consistency, have not only done nothing to remedy a great evil, but have carefully shut their eyes to the existence of the evil itself. Unfortunately, the imminent debates upon Reform will afford the Government ample excuse, if they are bent on seeking excuses, for forgetting the pledge which Sir JOHN PAKINGTON has given; but it is to administrative efficiency, if to anything, that the present Cabinet must trust for winning reputation, and nothing would so much conduce to the credit of the Ministry and of their FIRST LORD as a thorough scheme for the reform of a branch of the public service which, as the Duke of SOMERSET says, has been the subject of accusation and complaint from a period which transcends the power of human memory.

The broad confession of the chief of the Admiralty, that the system does not work and ought to be amended, almost disarms criticism on points of detail, and supersedes the necessity of a close examination of Mr. SEELY's charges, and the Duke of SOMERSET's defence of the late Board. The enormous difficulty of making out a specific case against a department which is in possession of all the evidence, and gives and withholds information at its own arbitrary will, might well have deterred a reformer less earnest than Mr. SEELY from the attempt to expose its shortcomings. From the nature of the case it was inevitable that a figure here and an inference there should be open to comment, and, considering all the hindrances in his way, it is most creditable to Mr. SEELY that he should have succeeded in establishing his most important accusations so entirely beyond question as to induce so business-like a Minister as Sir JOHN PAKINGTON to let judgment go by default. On a few points Sir JOHN does question, in general terms, the accuracy of Mr. SEELY's calculations. He says, for instance, that the extra price paid for anchors to BROWN, LENNOX, and Co. is not so much as 170,000*l.*, at which Mr. SEELY puts it; but he does not pretend to be able to say what the loss really has been, or on what data he dissents from Mr. SEELY's conclusion. He adds that the anchors have been improved since they came out last in an official trial; but he does not deny that, when tested a few years ago, they were the worst, as well as the dearest, that could be got; nor does he venture to challenge another competition. Mr. SEELY may be well content with these admissions on what is, after all, but a small part of his charges against the Board. So again, in reckoning the cost of building and repairing, Sir JOHN quarrels with Mr. SEELY's theory of charging incidental expenses and interest, and substitutes figures which, if less startling than those of the accuser of the Board, are quite enough to condemn it for stupid extravagance. On other subjects the same small criticism is used to mitigate the effect of Mr. SEELY's exposure of the Board of Admiralty; but on almost every point raised by that indefatigable inquirer, the FIRST LORD admits in effect that a substantial charge is made out, and in some particulars he does not even quarrel with Mr. SEELY's estimate of the magnitude of the offence. The case of the iron ballast—"SEELY's pigs"—is equally creditable to the sagacious pertinacity of the accuser and to the candid temper of the official who has known how to plead guilty—of course on behalf of his predecessor. Sir JOHN told the House in effect that he had investigated this matter to the bottom, and found that Mr. SEELY was entirely right, and the Duke of SOMERSET palpably wrong. Thus we have it on authority that there was nothing untrue or exaggerated in Mr. SEELY's statements, and that when he and his friends offered to lay down the best possible pavement, and to pay 100,000*l.* besides, if they were allowed to take away the "pigs," the Board of Admiralty would have lost money by accepting what seemed to be a mere bantering offer. The result of a careful analysis and a practical inquiry into the value of the wasted iron is that much of it is of a quality high enough for the manufacture of chilled shot, and all of it good enough to fetch something beyond an average price in the market. More, probably much more, than 100,000*l.* has been wantonly wasted in this item alone, and we confess we prefer Sir JOHN PAKINGTON's fair admission of the fact to the Duke of SOMERSET's attempt to laugh at the whole subject as too petty for the attention of so magnificent an institution as the Board of Admiralty. That Sir JOHN PAKINGTON should differ from Mr. SEELY as to the precise form to be given to

the accounts of naval expenditure, and the exact percentage for interest and incidental expenses to be charged on each ship, is only natural; but the material admission on the subject is that the accounts, though much improved since the time when they disclosed nothing at all, are not yet reduced to the right shape, and do not give the information which the public have a right to expect. The mere fact, which is not disputed, that the same articles are set down as costing twice as much in one dockyard as in another, is conclusive proof either of outrageous extravagance or else of utter imbecility in framing the accounts. The suggestion feebly made by way of defence, that the discrepancy arises merely from conflicting systems of account, only serves as an answer to one charge by establishing another which, if possible, is of a still graver character. But it is needless to pursue the details of evidence adduced for the plaintiff in an undefended cause. The Board of Admiralty has pleaded guilty, but unfortunately, under existing circumstances, it may very possibly escape the sentence of death which it deserves, unless the FIRST LORD himself should undertake, as he has more than half promised to do, the office of executioner.

Mr. SEELY, in opening his case, very properly acknowledged that it would be some sort of answer if the Board could safely appeal to the test of results. It is this which the Duke of SOMERSET, in his speech and in the pamphlet which we presume he is not unwilling to accept as a fair statement of the official case, has attempted with poor success to do. In a sense, he does answer the accusation, though only in the form in which he himself has chosen to put it. He says that it has been "asserted, and repeated again and again, that the Admiralty has, in the 'course of six years, wasted seventy millions of money 'voted for the purposes of the navy;' and it must be owned that he does prove that the Board has not expended that large amount of money without having something to show for it. But, so far as we can remember, the most rhetorical accuser of the Admiralty has never accused them of wasting every shilling of the money placed at their disposal. We all know that some work is done at the dockyards, that some good officers among the multitude employed have been paid salaries not too large for efficient work, that some iron-clads and a couple of turret ships have actually been launched, and that the Admiralty may with a good conscience assert that they have not thrown away all the money which has been voted for the navy. It was not necessary to compose an elaborate speech and a still more elaborate pamphlet to prove as much as this. The real charge is, and always has been, that the country has not got in return for its freehanded votes anything like as much as it ought to have got, and would have got under thrifty and intelligent management; and this charge the Duke of SOMERSET fails to meet, while his successor feels himself bound, on behalf of the Board, to plead guilty to it. It is a fact that our expenditure on the navy is about twice as great as that of any other country. It is equally a fact that we have much less dock accommodation than France, and certainly not a larger iron-clad fleet. Even the pamphlet speaks of the construction of some imperfect wooden iron-clads as having been forced upon us by the necessity of raising our navy "to an equality with the navies 'of other Powers.'" What is to be said of a system which, at a cost that no foreign country has emulated, has required the adoption of a makeshift style of construction in order to bring our fleet to a bare equality with theirs? English people are quite willing to pay freely to secure predominance on the ocean; but it will task the powers of more ingenious advocates than the Duke of SOMERSET to persuade them to spend twice as much as their neighbours in a scarcely successful effort to equal their results.

But after the satisfactory assurances which Mr. SEELY's motion has drawn forth, it is unnecessary to dwell on past shortcomings. It may be hoped that Sir JOHN PAKINGTON's Bill for the reorganization of the Admiralty will not be among the latest of the Ministerial measures, and when once fairly introduced, it will be the fault of the naval reformers in the House if the clauses are not moulded into a working shape. We assume in this what we believe may rightly be assumed, that Sir JOHN PAKINGTON is thoroughly in earnest in his desire to root out the abuses of his department, and that the promise of Reform is not to be forgotten as some other promises of political Reform have been, as soon as they had served their purpose of appeasing complaints too well founded to be directly answered.

THE CRETAN INSURRECTION.

THE Correspondence on the disturbances in Crete possesses historical rather than diplomatic interest. Lord STANLEY has, from the commencement of the insurrection, maintained strict neutrality, although, in conformity with the traditions of the Foreign Office, he has administered several lectures to the Greek and Turkish Governments. When a person of a didactic turn finds that advice is not relished by his equals, he can only employ his gifts in reproving his inferiors and dependents. Lord STANLEY has personally no passion for officious interference, but, as an English Foreign Minister, he cannot at once abandon Greeks and Turks to their own questionable devices. His counsels are undeniably sound, and his reproofs to the Government of Athens are thoroughly well deserved. The King of GREECE and his Ministers have scarcely preserved a decorous veil of hypocrisy in their encouragement of the Cretan insurrection. As Lord STANLEY frequently reminds them, the condition of the Ionian Islands since the cession of the Protectorate by England raises a doubt whether further annexation would tend to the extension of good government. To the Porte, the advice of England has been consistent and sound. It is highly expedient that the Cretans should be well governed when they are reduced to submission, and that during the struggle the Mahometan soldiery should be restrained from acts of cruelty and violence. Lord STANLEY's only definite suggestion is founded on the precedent of the Lebanon, where Turkish subjects of different religions are placed under separate administrations belonging to their own respective creeds. The GRAND VIZIER, however, objects to the scheme as tending to the dissolution of the Empire, and the English Government emphatically disclaims any intention of supporting its advice by active interference. As the civil war still continues, definite plans for the government of Crete are not immediately important.

The first proceedings of the meeting of Cretan chiefs which prepared the insurrection, under pretence of framing a petition to the SULTAN, sufficiently prove that the outbreak had been arranged in concert with the Hellenic Government. Mr. DICKSON, the English Consul, seems at first to have believed that the chiefs and popular leaders really desired the redress of certain specified grievances. In a petition which was addressed to the SULTAN in the month of May, the representatives of the Christian population complained of the maladministration of justice, of undue interference with municipal elections, of the want of roads and schools, and of some indirect taxes. In his recent speech in the House of Commons, Mr. GREGORY dilated on the same abuses, as if the object of the Cretan insurgents had been administrative reform. The petitioners indeed describe themselves as His IMPERIAL MAJESTY's faithful subjects, and with duly loyal courtesy they "raise their voices for the SULTAN's long life 'and happiness.'" But, exactly at the same time the chiefs and deputies signed a second petition to each of the three Governments of England, France, and Russia, in which they openly avowed their real desire of annexation to the Hellenic Kingdom. They were already in correspondence with General KALERGI, Master of the Horse at the Court of Athens; and King GEORGE himself afterwards informed Mr. ERSKINE that he had received an offer from foreign Greeks of 4,000,000 drachmas and 10,000 muskets, to be used in aid of the rebellion. The insurgent forces have constantly received reinforcements and supplies from the mainland of Greece, and on one occasion the Government corvette *Hellas* actually convoyed a blockade-runner on its voyage with men and munitions. The Hellenic Government, which has not commenced the formation of roads at home, has certainly not been inspired by indignation at the neglect of the Turkish Governors to improve the internal communications of Crete. Having allowed the Ionian Islands to degenerate into anarchy as soon as they were deprived of the mild and regular administration of England, King GEORGE would probably govern Crete, if it were annexed to his dominions, on nearly the same principles which have been adopted in practice by successive Pashas.

It is nevertheless a question whether the flagrant violation of neutrality by the Greeks deserves moral disapprobation. The Government is urged on by the people, and the volunteers undergo dangers and hardships from motives of patriotism, if the term can be applied to sympathy with the subjects of a foreign Government. The Greeks of the Kingdom bear the same relation to the Christians of the island which has been thought to justify the policy of CAVOUR and the exploits of GARIBALDI. The Cretans and their allies care nothing for good roads, and little for fiscal systems, but they desire to

dethrone a foreign and hostile Government. Great courage and endurance must have been displayed in the struggle, although it is impossible to distinguish truth and falsehood in the indigenous reports. The Ottoman Government has, from first to last, employed 50,000 regular troops in the war, and the able-bodied Christian population of the island can scarcely exceed that number. Warlike virtues are not the completion of a perfect political character, but they are indispensable conditions of greatness. If the Greeks had not been equal to the Turks themselves in military daring, their intellectual superiority would not have been sufficient to cover their many moral defects. The exertions which have been made will probably not have proved wholly abortive, for the three Great Powers are about to urge on the Porte the concession to the Christians of Crete of some kind of municipal independence. England and France are not, however, disposed to countenance the aspirations or the encroachments of the Hellenic Government. As the Marquis of MOUTIER told Mr. DELEJEORGES, Greece could not be allowed to precipitate the solution of the Eastern question. The Greeks of the Kingdom will submit to the rebuff, in the well-founded confidence that the gratification of their wishes is but temporarily delayed. As misgovernment had little or nothing to do with the insurrection, improvements in administration will not reconcile the Cretans to Ottoman rule. The concessions which they may have extorted will, in fact, be an encouragement to them in future enterprises; and any municipal government which they may themselves administer will be the nucleus of a standing conspiracy against the Porte. Although Russia is for the present acting in concert with England and France, the Greeks and the Cretans well understand the distinction between suspended patronage and vigilant supervision. The diplomatic position of Russia as to the affairs of the East is strengthened by the unexpected adhesion of Austria. Baron BEUST has recommended the Porte to withdraw the Servian garrisons, which have long ceased to discharge their original function of guarding the Turkish frontier against Austrian hostility. By a singular revulsion of policy, Baron BEUST also proposes the revision of the clauses in the Treaty of 1856 which were framed by the Austrian Government of the time as necessary securities against Russian ambition. In the same Circular he announces that his Government has no desire to interfere in the Cretan question, but the Porte will be seriously alarmed by the apparent defection of its old and powerful ally. It had always been supposed that Austria was united with Turkey under the pressure of a common interest, while England and France were far more remotely concerned in the maintenance of the Eastern equilibrium.

The argument for maintaining the Ottoman Empire was stated in the House of Commons by Mr. LAYARD with remarkable ability and force. Crete itself furnishes an instance of the complications which render hasty and violent changes inexpedient. The rights and interests of 80,000 or 90,000 Mahometans in the island are entitled to careful consideration, notwithstanding the discreditable intolerance of too many Christian philanthropists. In European Turkey there are three or four millions of the same warlike race, who must be forcibly removed before a united Greek or Slavonic Empire can supersede the Turkish dominion. To drive this vast population from their homes would be cruelly unjust, and it is still more to the purpose that the attempt would be dangerous, if not impracticable. The subject races are perhaps more capable of improvement than the Turks, but they are scarcely more competent at present to establish civilized Governments. For every outrage which can be ascribed to a Mahometan, an equally atrocious crime may readily be brought home to a Christian. The mob which lately assaulted the returning volunteers at the Piræus was at least as remote from the influences of humanity as any Turkish rabble. The Greek volunteers at Syra lately murdered an offending man for the sole offence of being a Mahometan, and many cruelties have been perpetrated in the Christian villages of Crete by the insurgents themselves. It is satisfactory to find that, notwithstanding a diametrical opposition of theoretical opinion, Mr. LAYARD concurs with Mr. GREGORY and Mr. GLADSTONE in approving the safe and innocuous tenour of Lord STANLEY's despatches.

FRANCE AND THE FRENCH EMPEROR.

FRENCHMEN cannot but take a keen interest in the Yellow-book which has recently appeared. Soon after the inauguration of the Second Empire, France emerged into European prominence; and after fifteen years of Imperialism, ambitious French politicians are beginning to think that she is again

receding into the shade. Nobody can doubt that whatever is befalling her (whether it is on the whole a good or an evil) is attributable to the policy of the French EMPEROR. He has stirred up Europe to its foundations. He set the principle of nationalities afloat in the Italian war, he has protected it ever since in his various diplomatic negotiations, and at last he sees it triumphant over a large portion of the Continent. If M. THIERS is right, such a result is a heavy blow and discouragement to the French nation. Europe no longer trembles at the sound of French arms, or is agitated as it used to be by French ideas. And M. THIERS desires to see France always dominant, always active, and always governed by its journalists—a military empire to the world at large, a literary republic at home. His notion of political perfection would be a modern Rome administered by CICEROS, but ruling the world by means of a prestige like that of the CÆSARS. From such a point of view the Empire is not a success. Nations as great and as full of vitality as itself are hemming in France on every side. German democracy threatens to take the wind out of the sails of the French Revolution. Italy is rising into prominence, and has given the first proof of independence by dispensing in a great war with French assistance, and with French advice. Who can even be sure that the Eastern question, that battlefield for intriguing diplomatists, will remain under the shadow of the wings of France. The EMPEROR began by being an underrated man. Taking advantage of the mistake of his contemporaries, he became the first power in Europe. In the opinion of a considerable school he is over-rated now. France trusted in hot haste to the brilliancy of his Imperial *début*, and when it is too late she finds that his genius is not infallible.

If this opinion becomes universal upon the other side of the Channel, the prospects of the EMPEROR's son and successor cannot but be seriously impaired. A young dynasty depends for its chance of fortune on the success, if not upon the merits, of its founder. Had CÆSAR taken no firm hold upon the imaginations of the Roman people there would never have been an AUGUSTUS; far less would the name and the popularity of the first CÆSAR have sufficed to establish for centuries a despotism at variance with the traditions of the nation. In like manner, the throne of NAPOLEON IV. can only be secured by the political achievements of NAPOLEON III. Every single incident in the present reign may accordingly be fruitful in consequences hereafter. A repulse in Mexico or Germany will not perhaps shake the present occupant in his Imperial saddle, but it will tell upon the chances of his heir, and an inglorious Yellow-book is a dynastic misfortune. Under such circumstances, it is not uninteresting to consider what is the nature of the hold that the NAPOLEONS really have upon France, and how far this hold is affected by the diplomatic and political occurrences of the last few years.

The popularity of the First NAPOLEON is an important item in such a calculation. In spite of all that is annually said and done in his honour, it is certain that the French would not at all care to see him alive again. It is thoroughly understood at last by the majority of the nation that his reign, with all its fame, exhausted France; and that his great administrative powers were a poor compensation for all the mischief he brought upon the country. The proper place for so expensive a hero is the Invalides or the Pantheon. Frenchmen have no wish to see a second edition of him at the Tuileries. It is scarcely a correct account of French democracy to say that it gravitates steadily towards despotism. Despotism is rather a prolonged phase under which French democracy is ripening to something more advanced, and those who best understand our Gallican neighbours believe that they are not likely to accept Imperialism as a permanent solution of the difficulties of popular government. But, when all is said, it cannot be denied that it is a great advantage to the present dynasty to be united with the recollection of a great name. The BOURBONS and the ORLEANISTS have no such introduction to start with. They have popular prejudice, often unjust, to contend against, if ever it comes to their turn again to compete for national favour; and though there are Orleanists living who would do credit to any throne, universal suffrage would probably pronounce itself to-morrow in favour of their less worthy competitors. Should the EMPEROR's life be prematurely shortened by accident or disease, it is scarcely among the old Royal families of France that the PRINCE IMPERIAL would find his most considerable rival. The most serious antagonism to which he would be subjected is probably the antagonism of democracy itself. The great question, therefore, is—how far French democracy is likely to bring itself to believe that its own interests are identical with the interests of the Imperial family.

It is obvious that French democracy may not always stand

in need of a champion on the throne at all. So long as it is threatened, either by class or Church interests from within, or by foreign enmities from without, it will want to concentrate its power in the hands of a representative dynasty. The complete triumph of the democratic spirit in Europe and in France may put an end to this necessity. Meanwhile, and until the consummation is achieved, there is a definite line of policy which French democracy expects from its representative heroes; and until the NAPOLEON dynasty is committed to this line, it will not take firm root, or be identified with the idea of French progress. And, first of all, the French masses, or the more intelligent of them, require that their Government should set about cultivating, in a scientific way, the internal resources of the nation. These resources are of two kinds. There are the natural resources of France—opportunities for great railways, canals, and public works, and whatever is spent on these increases permanently the national capital, and helps forward accordingly the masses. Next there are the masses themselves to be cultivated, considered as a collection of innumerable individual centres of dormant energy and strength. No part of the programme of French democracy is more distinct than that which looks forward to the cultivation of the people on the principles on which a prudent capitalist or agriculturist would cultivate anything else. The democratic classes in France hold that a great deal has yet to be done to carry out the doctrine of absolute equality and fraternity. Have they not got as much in this direction as they can well have without naked communism? French democracy does not think so. All Frenchmen are equal before the law, and in the presence of a French prefect, but all Frenchmen do not start with equal chances in life. The revolutionary school wish to see the poor man's children no longer weighted at their start in life with the position of their father, but entering on the race on equal terms with the son of the richest proprietor in the land. It is curious how all philosophy, both in politics and in other things, has a tendency to repeat itself, and this view is after all only a return to views which are familiar to us from the history of the past. It comes to this, that though the laws of property may be left on their present footing, it is the business of a State to rear its own young. It is, on this theory, an unjustifiable waste of State power if the degradation or penury of a particular class is allowed to drag down the fresh generation that springs from its loins into the mire.

A dynasty which would countenance, and assist in carrying into effect, the above programme would certainly, under present circumstances, have a chance of the support of French democracy. What foreign policy democracy demands becomes every day simpler and more obvious. The French masses have a blind fraternal instinct, not with Germany or with Italy, or with this or that Foreign Office, but with their brethren of the masses everywhere. This instinct with the most extreme of the school is so strong as to drown all national jealousy and vanity. It is true that every Frenchman, whether rich or poor, has a natural propensity to insist on showing the world the way to everything. And, as long as there are wars and rumours of wars in France, French peasants, like French shopkeepers, are capable of bristling with prejudices and antipathies. A long reign of peace would materially impair the national, and add to cosmopolitan, instincts of the lower classes. It is only because they have been drilled in France to care about the Rhine frontier that they care about it at all. In reality, they have other and more practical dreams. To a certain extent, and to a certain extent only, the French EMPEROR has made himself the champion of this decided democratic movement. He has done this warily and cautiously, and without attracting the attention of the world outside to what he is doing. But he has not yet nailed his colours to the mast, and though the French masses enjoy being told that their EMPEROR seems to breathe more freely when he is among them, they are clear-sighted enough to judge with perfect accuracy of the value of fine words. His career is now drawing towards its end; and as yet he has not absolutely identified his dynasty with the interests of any one class in France, though he has done something to conciliate all. As his foreign policy languishes, a more vigorous policy must take its place at home. Possibly increased literary latitude is to be given to the educated classes, but it is equally on the cards that the EMPEROR may deem it his safest course to initiate some great democratic measures of a more material kind which, to use a French expression, will strengthen his dynasty at its base.

MR. BRIGHT'S LETTER.

WHEN recently we deprecated the inquisitive censoriousness which probed the relations between Mr. BRIGHT and his workmen, and which analysed the economy of his establishment at Rochdale, we felt that the tactics of his enemies were as false on strategical as they were culpable on social grounds. It was a waste of power. It was recurring to unusual and unnecessary, as well as unjustifiable, weapons, when the very object of assault supplied abundance of ordinary weapons for the purpose. There is no wisdom in forcing one's adversary's house to look for a bludgeon to beat him with, when he is himself pitching shillelaghs into the hands of his enemies. Had the accusation against Mr. BRIGHT been ever so true, which it was not, it really is a matter of the least possible moment whether Mr. BRIGHT is a good master or a bad master, whether he is kind and charitable or hard and penurious in times of general poverty and distress. Of course, if he were proved to be habitually ungenerous, stingy, and mean in his treatment of his workpeople, the fact would suffice to brand him with hypocrisy in addition to all his other faults. But what boots this? Hypocrisy is not an uncommon vice, and political hypocrisy is not unlikely to find numerous defenders. Mr. BRIGHT's sins have gone far beyond the orbit to which such mild delinquencies belong. They are of an entirely different order, character, and import. Even if a man could, by reference to Mr. BRIGHT's private diary and his banker's book, prove him to be as great a hypocrite as ever lived, yet he would have left untouched the peculiar and distinctive deformities of his conduct. It is quite unnecessary to look for hypocrisy in Mr. BRIGHT's political career. His public offences constitute too momentous grounds for indignation to admit of being dealt with as mere breaches of candour and consistency. It is a matter for congratulation that, while he cannot be charged with being a hypocrite, he is certainly weak as a tactician. The same malign temperament precludes him from simulation and from management. That small section of professed politicians which is grouped round him below the gangway, or acts as his staff on London platforms, must often endure agonies of mortification at the unseasonableness of his irritation and the turbulence of his outbursts. It may be that they are honest in the opinions which they profess, and zealous for the objects which they propose. If so, their vexation must indeed be keen against the leader who makes their cause a scandal and an offence in the eyes of all moderate and judicious men.

That he has done this, and done this most effectually, any one may satisfy himself by talking with his immediate neighbours, or looking at the provincial papers. The fears of all men in the middle and educated classes have been aroused by the prospect of a Jacobinical Reform Bill. The Liberal newspapers throughout the country, with few exceptions, repeat and disseminate these fears. And just at the most opportune nick of time Mr. BRIGHT appears on the scene, not to remove or tranquillize, but to justify and intensify them. Of course the Government Resolutions have formed the natural subject of communication between members of Parliament and their constituents. A general but moderate tone of disapproval has satisfied the zeal of the mass of Liberal members. They have convinced themselves that the most obnoxious of the Resolutions will be obnoxious enough to be struck out by the House, while others, for aught they know, may be elastic enough to be expanded. Not so Mr. BRIGHT; a course that would satisfy a just man, a moderate man, or a statesman would not satisfy him. The occasion was one for venting the most splenetic invectives against the Government, the House, and the Constitution. So Mr. BRIGHT seized it and made use of it. The following are parts of his letter to the Reformers of Bradford:—"The Administration is bitterly hostile to Reform. When in opposition this was abundantly proved, and it is confirmed by its course since its accession to office." Now this is an assertion of what Mr. BRIGHT cannot know to be true, and might, if he reflected, find some reason for believing to be untrue. A Government which brings before Parliament certain Resolutions shadowing forth a scheme of Reform, and throws upon the House of Commons the duty of modifying, extending, or rejecting these Resolutions, cannot, with any adherence to the ordinary meaning of words, be called "bitterly hostile to Reform." Here is a plan which may be faulty or defective, but which undoubtedly does embody some of the principles for which all Reformers have contended. The authors of such a plan can only be termed bitter enemies of Reform by the most reckless exaggeration of the blindest bigotry. They might have been called lukewarm friends or lukewarm enemies, but so tame

a statement would have fallen short of the boisterous requirements of a Northern Reform meeting. He then goes on to say that the Ministry "seeks to murder the cause and the question by a course contrary to all Parliamentary usage, and odious in the sight of all honest men." As the Bradford operatives are not likely to know or care much for Parliamentary usage, it is perhaps superfluous to attempt their enlightenment on this score; but as they may be aware that some honest folk do live out of Bradford, it may be as well to tell them that the course taken by the Government is not odious in the sight of all these men. After hurling these random words at the Government, abuse equally wild against the Parliament was only natural. He proceeds:—"If the House joins in the guilt of this proceeding, it will only add to the distrust with which it is now regarded by vast multitudes of people in all parts of the country." That is, if the House does that which it has frequently done before on difficult questions—namely, discuss Resolutions offered as the basis of an important Bill—it will be vastly distrusted by Mr. BRIGHT's friends. Of course any proceeding of the House of Commons may be wholly distasteful to many of Mr. BRIGHT's friends, at Bradford and elsewhere; but probably the House will survive their displeasure, as it has survived the displeasure of Wilkites, Luddites, Chartists, and Fenians. "You are right," he continues, "in holding meetings; in every town and village meetings should be held. . . . If meetings have no effect—if the open and almost universal expression of opinion has no power on the Administration and on the Legislature—then inevitably the minds of the people will seek other channels, with a view to obtain and secure the rights which are contemptuously denied them. If I am wrong in believing this, then history is a lie from the beginning, and we have all been mistaken in our estimate of the causes out of which many of the great and deplorable transactions it has recorded have sprung."

The translation of these passages into more simple English is not difficult. If peaceful meetings do not succeed in bullying Parliament into forgetfulness of its duty and a tremulous precipitation of undigested measures, then, as we understand Mr. BRIGHT to mean, they must be superseded by physical violence. Physical force must do that which moral force has failed to do, and an armed procession to Westminster must consummate what was left undone by an unarmed procession to Islington. When the glaziers and the painters and the bricklayers and the carpenters stand with fixed bayonets in Palace Yard, it is hoped that the besieged Parliament will turn out any number of Reform Bills, or any other Bills, without going through the formality of deliberation. The Tribune will be there to pronounce his *"Sic volo, sic jubeo"* on behalf of the dominant Plebs, and it will only be for Parliament passively to register its edicts. Or, if it does not, great and deplorable "transactions" will spring. In other words—if, at least, there is meaning in language—there will be a conflict, and reason will give place to violence. We may wonder at the coolness with which a professed "man of peace" suggests an appeal to the arms of angry multitudes, and conceives the probability of civil commotion. We may, however, relieve our minds by pitting one inconsistency against another. It is not more strange that a man of peace should contemplate the collision of armed and excited numbers than that a Liberal member should desire to dispense with an ancient form of Parliamentary discussion. Mr. BRIGHT has long merged the instincts of the advocate of peace and the Liberal in that hot and despotic intolerance of antagonism which made the clubs of the Revolution and the leaders of the Mountain thirst for blood and revenge. But Mr. BRIGHT delights in references to the history of his country. If ever he can command a season when his mind is free from the spirit of hatred and malevolence, there are pages which he may read with profit. When he does, he will find that there was a period in the annals of England when the heart of the people was deeply stirred in defence of a free Parliament. Nor would it be difficult to arouse the same enthusiasm again. The same people would regard with the same feelings an attempt to control the deliberations of the Legislature, either by the armed retainers of a military usurper, or by the armed multitudes of Reform Leagues.

It may also occur to Mr. BRIGHT that he has been as inaccurate in his language as he was rash in his purpose, when he vouched for the co-operation of an indignant country in his assaults upon Parliament. He has referred in his letter to the year 1832. Does he recollect that year? If he does not, we do. And we may inform him that the temper of the people was very different then

from what it is now. One intense passion then pervaded the majority of the middle-classes. Men of property and education harangued mobs and headed processions. There was not a town in England where men conspicuous for their station and wealth and talent were not also conspicuous as agitators. What does he see now? Intelligence and education cowed, and almost desponding, at the prospect of some national crisis; capital and property dismayed at the attitude of the popular party and the bluster of its leaders; but all resolved to contend bravely, rather than to concede ignominiously and indiscriminately. Before Mr. BRIGHT again compares the years 1832 and 1867, he ought to study the annals of 1832. Even by this time it must be apparent to him that, though, in the restricted sense in which that word is used by members of Reform Leagues and Trades' Unions, "the country" is very angry that household suffrage has not been proclaimed from the Royal Exchange and primogeniture abolished by Royal Edict, the country in its widest and most comprehensive sense has not the slightest wish to interrupt or to menace the deliberative proceedings of its Great Council. Neither, among sensible politicians, can he see any desire to court the ridicule of nations by a travesty of those great popular commotions which, justifiable and needful when all classes of a people suffer wrong, are at once mischievous and absurd when a hot and angry demagogue uses them only to inflame the passions of one class against the interests of others, and to kindle hatred and envy under the specious pretext of demanding equal rights and a constitutional franchise.

MORAL CONTROVERSIES.

TOWARDS the end of Bossuet's final philippic against Protestantism, the *Sixième Avertissement aux Protestants*, there occurs a passage in which he deals with those "who say that it is in regard of morals that the way to heaven is to be kept narrow, and that it may be enlarged in regard of dogmas. All, say our Indifferents, turns upon a good life; as to that there is no obscurity in Scripture, and no division amongst Christians. This, under the pretext of piety, is the elyest and most dangerous hypocrisy." He then goes on to argue that the teaching of the Church is quite as essential in regard to morality as in regard to dogma. "If we begin to reason on the doctrine of morals, on enmities, on usury, on mortification, on lying, on chastity, on marriage, setting out with the principle that the Holy Scripture must be reduced to sound reason" (*la droite raison*), "where shall we not go? Will it not be as easy to persuade men that it has not pleased God to carry their obligations beyond the principles of good sense, as to persuade them that it has not pleased him to carry their faith beyond good reasoning?" But inasmuch as opinions may differ in regard to morals, we shall have to tolerate moral as well as doctrinal mistakes; and the ultimate result will be an absence of moral authority equal and parallel to the absence of dogmatic authority. This, like the rest of the work to which it belongs, forms part of a controversy with various authors who are cited, and with whose teaching we have little to do in the present day; but the remark suggests some of the most curious points in the whole range of speculation—points to which we think far too little attention has been paid by those who have written on this subject.

The first and most remarkable of these consists in the fact that, notwithstanding all that is and has been said upon the subject of the immutable character of morality, the inherent difference between right and wrong, and the infallibility of the individual conscience in pointing out the distinction between them, morality has, in point of fact, varied immensely from age to age and from country to country; and this not only amongst countries divided from each other by differences of race and creed, but in the very same country, and under the influences of the very same creed. This fact is so little appreciated that it is worth while to insist upon and illustrate it a little, before proceeding to draw the inferences which it suggests. Let us, then, consider in what respects moral systems must resemble each other, and in what respects they can differ. We will afterwards consider how far, in point of fact, they actually do differ.

All moral systems are regulated by some ideal of human conduct and character, and classify the actions of life according to their agreement with or divergency from this ideal. All of them are intended to regulate human conduct, and are therefore armed with some sanction; and these sanctions are three in number—the religious or ecclesiastical, the legal, and the moral or popular sanction. Casuistry appealed almost exclusively to the ecclesiastical sanction. The bad action of the casuists was a sin to be confessed, and to be taken into account by a confessor in giving or withholding absolution. Moral theories in all countries are armed, to an extent and in shapes which vary indefinitely, with the legal sanction; and, to whatever extent this is the case at a given time and place, they are laws in the proper sense of the word. An action condemned by such a theory is a crime or a wrong as the case may be. Lastly, modern theories of morality appeal, as a rule, to the popular, and also to the conscientious, sanction, which again they try to bring into harmony with each other. The actions condemned by such theories as these are acts of which men dis-

approve, though there is no specific name which contradistinguishes them as clearly as crimes and sins. To use a legal metaphor, the legal sanction *sounds* in human punishment, the ecclesiastical sanction in divine miraculous punishment, and the popular and conscientious sanction in disapprobation either by the public or by a man's own feelings. This being the nature of moral systems, it is easy to see in what respects they can differ. They may be founded on different ideals of character. They may apply their sanctions to different actions, and the sanctions so applied may differ indefinitely in point of severity. Moreover, each of the three systems may at different times be more or less effectual, both in itself and in comparison with the two others.

We doubt whether many persons are habitually aware of the extent to which moral systems have, in point of fact, varied in Christian Europe, in all these respects, even in modern times. If we take into our view other parts of the world, it would probably result, from a full examination of the subject, that no one moral doctrine whatever would fulfil the test *quod semper quod ubique quod ab omnibus*. Particular actions might no doubt be mentioned which would be approved or blamed by almost all human beings at all times; but it would be difficult to mention a single moral rule or principle which has always been conceived in the same way, placed on the same basis, and worked out into the same consequences. First of all, take the ideal by which moral systems are regulated at different times. If this differs, it is obvious that the difference will be repeated in every part of the various systems founded upon it. Now, in point of fact, it has differed widely. One opinion which has exercised immense influence over the whole course of moral speculation has been that good and evil differ from each other in their essence, that they are the names of qualities inherent in our actions independently of any consideration as to their being forbidden or permitted by a superior, and also independently of the nature of the consequences which they may produce. Another theory measures the goodness and badness of actions by their results. So, again, the will of God has usually been regarded in modern Europe as at all events the principal sanction of morals, and, so far as it was capable of being recognised, as the great guide towards ascertaining what is right and what not; but the most various opinions have prevailed at different times, and amongst different people at the same time, as to the Divine character, and these opinions have been reflected in every part of every moral system founded upon them.

A very few illustrations will show how wide and important are the differences in respect of practical morality which flow from these two sources—namely, the controversy as to the nature of right and wrong, and the different views which prevail as to the Divine character. A good illustration of them may be found in the different theories which have prevailed as to justice. Suppose, first, that right and wrong mean something more than conformity with, or divergence from, a rule tending to promote the general happiness—admit that a thing may be right and good though it has no relation at all to the happiness of any sentient being, or to the commands issued by any such being—and it is obvious that you may at once get the well-known opposition between justice and mercy. Justice is the enforcing of certain rules having a tendency to bring about that which is right and good in itself, no matter what may be the consequences to individuals. Mercy, on the other hand, is the desire to save individuals from the penalties which justice inflicts. The two therefore are, or may be, directly opposed to each other; and if God be regarded as a being at once just and merciful, it is obvious that these attributes will clash, and produce discordant and inconsistent results. If, however, right and wrong are regarded as denoting conformity with or divergence from rules calculated to promote happiness, then the whole opposition between justice and mercy vanishes; justice is nothing but systematic benevolence, and that which is unjust can no more be merciful than that which is unmerciful can be just. The punishment of a criminal is not more unmerciful than a surgical operation. The pardon of a criminal, when it can be granted consistently with the objects of law, is no more unjust than the omission of an operation which is not required. The matter may perhaps be made still plainer by a broader illustration. It is obvious that our view of the nature of sins and crimes will correspond to our theory of the character of moral distinctions. Upon the one theory, sin or crime is something indefinitely terrible and tremendous, the nature of which can hardly be described or even conjectured. Upon the other theory, it is constantly tending to be viewed as a mistake or a disease. Again, the theory of the true character of punishment, and therefore the limitations imposed upon its nature and extent, will differ according to these differences. The theory of propitiation or expiation is connected with the one principle, the theory of example and reformatory discipline with the other. The notion of propitiation, again, readily connects itself with asceticism. Suffering, upon this view, is a good thing in itself, because it has a remedial efficacy against evil. It is needless to dwell upon the practical results of this divergence, which goes down to the very roots of morality, and acts upon practice in every conceivable way. We can see the two modes of thought at work in all directions, bearing on all sorts of subjects, and affecting people's conduct and actions in all the most important affairs of life.

Moral controversies, however, differ not only in their general complexion, but in the ideal at which they aim. This difference works itself out in detail in reference to particular actions. People often suppose that morals are simple and uniform because particular sweeping maxims are generally received. Honour thy father

and thy mother, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet, are no doubt maxims of which the force is, and has been, recognised, all over Christendom at all events, for eighteen centuries. This, however, when examined, proves only a very general resemblance in the morality of different ages and countries. It shows that the subject-matter of all morality is the same—namely, the regulation of human conduct in certain particulars; but it by no means proves that all human conduct has been regulated by the same rules. Indeed, in respect to every one of these maxims it might be shown that wide differences of opinion and practice—differences which can be fully understood only by reference to principles lying at the root of the whole matter—have prevailed and do still prevail even in Christian countries. "Honour thy father and thy mother" is a precept which in its obvious and primary sense has been interpreted in very different ways, as the varying extent of parental authority, both by law and by custom in different countries, fully proves. Take a single illustration. To what extent have parents a right to forbid the marriage of their children? Both the practice and the law differ widely in England and France. Parental authority, however, is commonly taken by moralists as the type of all authority, and "Honour thy father and thy mother" as an injunction to obey the civil government. What are men's relations to civil governments? How, and by what principles, is the duty of obedience to them limited? "Thou shalt do no murder." Is war murder? Is capital punishment murder? Is duelling murder? "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Is divorce permissible? Within what limits of relationship is marriage forbidden, and on what principles are those limits fixed? Is polygamy wrong, and, if so, is it wrong because it is forbidden, or forbidden because it is wrong? "Thou shalt not steal." How far is a man's right to his property absolute? When and how may he be deprived of it for the public good? Is it theft to confiscate corporate property, as in the case of monasteries? Was it theft to disfranchise the rotten boroughs in 1832? Is conquest theft and robbery? "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." In what cases may we deviate from the truth? "Thou shalt not covet." Is all ambition and all desire of what we have not got sinful, and, if not, why not, and how otherwise? Endless differences of opinion exist upon all these questions, and upon a thousand others into which they branch off, and each of the questions arising upon them is susceptible of as many different answers as there are views of the nature of good and evil in general, of the character of God, and of the ideal of human life. It is worth while to observe, in passing, how strikingly these observations display the truth that our knowledge rises from the particular to the general, and does not descend from the general to the particular. A number of ways of dealing with property are called theft; but when you come to consider whether a particular act is theft or not, the maxim "Thou shalt not steal" is useless, for it forbids the act in question only if it is theft. Hence the general use of such words as theft, murder, adultery, and the rest proves, not that there is a general consent as to right and wrong, but that in all times and countries some ways of destroying life or dealing with property, and some kinds of relations between the sexes, have been disapproved and stigmatised by a dyslogistic epithet.

Even these differences, wide as they undoubtedly are, form only a part of the controversies which exist on moral subjects. Moral theories, as we have observed, are enforced by different sanctions, and are framed for different purposes, and the degrees of influence of these different theories upon different persons at different times are indefinitely dissimilar. Take, for instance, the casuistical view of morality, or, as it is more properly called, the view of writers on moral theology. It would require an acquaintance with writers on this subject to which we do not pretend to give anything like a fair account of the way in which they deal with moral problems, and it would require knowledge which no one possesses to give an account of the practical working of the system founded on their theories, or to attempt to appreciate its value. A few remarks, however, may be offered which we believe are not substantially incorrect, though they are of necessity very slight. Casuists regard morality as a vast system of criminal law administered by priests in confessionals, where the penitent is the accuser and the witness, and the priest the judge. From their point of view, every sin, even if it be only a sin of thought, is a crime for which the criminal is liable to temporal or eternal punishment as the case may be, unless he is relieved from it by repentance, penance, and absolution. It is obvious that this requires the most detailed analysis of human conduct as being either sinful or not sinful; and, if sinful, as being either mortally or venially sinful. To read a casuist is like walking, as Jeremy Taylor said, through a hospital. You see case after case detailed with all the precision and minuteness of a law report, and marked off from each other by circumstances which, in the writer's opinion, distinguish the mortal from the venial sin, or, as lawyers would say, the felony from the misdemeanour. As the Roman Catholic Church itself authorizes the writings of casuists only in a negative way, i.e. as containing nothing worthy of condemnation, there is a great conflict of opinions as to the character of sins and as to the sinfulness of particular acts; and perhaps all the great moral controversies would be found to repeat themselves in the works of the casuists. What, for instance, can be more significant than the great controversy as to the love of God, upon which the Jesuits maintained that mere abstinence from sinful

acts, arising from fear of punishment, was all that was requisite to salvation; and that attrition (fear of being damned) and absolution were together enough to secure a man's pardon for such sinful acts? According to this doctrine—part of which was energetically combated by other Roman Catholic divines, and especially by Bossuet—the meanest and most vicious coward might sneak into heaven if his cowardice only took the right turn, and if he had the luck to get hold of a priest when he was dying. We do not at present inquire into the question of the truth of this system. We merely wish to point out how essentially it differs from the moral theories which exercise the greatest amount of influence in our own time and country, and which address themselves, not to the legal sanction, natural or supernatural, but to the sanction enforced by the conscience of the individual and the consciences of the public at large. The difference lies in the fact that, in the one case, nothing is decided but a question which at bottom is purely legal. Does this act expose me, ay or no, to a certain penalty? In the other case, the question may possibly be put into a legal form. Is this act one which will involve the penalty of a bad conscience and of public disapproval wherever it is known, and of the disapproval of God, whether expressed in the form of punishment or not? But the character of these penalties is so peculiar that it is almost an abuse of language to give them such a name. They are rather guides towards an ideal, to be reached at last in some measure and with many shortcomings, than punishments proper. They one and all imply in various ways that to avoid punishment is a subordinate matter; indeed, that we ought not to seek to avoid it, but to welcome it as a good when it is required, inasmuch as the really important thing is to be in a state of moral health, to which wise punishment powerfully contributes. These two conceptions of the nature of moral rules—the conception which makes them a system of criminal law, and the conception which makes them, so to speak, counsels for the soul's health—render the rules themselves of which the systems are composed exceedingly different, and exercise in different ages of the world different kinds and degrees of influence over human conduct.

We have now attempted to give a sort of sketch of the magnitude of the moral controversies which exist in the world, and of the manner in which they embrace every point as to which moral theories can possibly differ. This review, which might be indefinitely lengthened, suggests, amongst other things, a question which is asked by Bayle. How does it happen, he says, that differences upon questions of dogmatic theology, to which it is hardly possible for people in general to attach any significance at all, should have caused irreconcilable quarrels, and brought men to the stake by hundreds, whilst differences affecting the whole cast of our conduct and the whole course of our life have been regarded as open questions, on which the widest differences might prevail without offence even amongst members of the same communion? A few cases may undoubtedly be mentioned—like that of the Quakers—in which religious bodies have been distinguished principally by their views upon questions of morals. In the main, however, Bayle's observation is perfectly true, and will be found to hold good in our own days as well as in his. It must be within almost every one's experience that people show great distress and anxiety upon the subject of their doctrinal views, and that, when these views are disturbed in any way, they look in all directions for some one who will take off their hands the responsibility of having an opinion on such subjects. On the other hand, they are seldom, if ever, distressed by difficulties on the subject of morality, unless they immediately affect their own personal conduct in regard to some particular transaction; and even then the light desired is rather with a view to the decision of the particular question than with a view to the general principle on which it depends, however important that may be. In a word, ignorance or uncertainty as to moral questions appears to be considered as natural as the same state of mind about dogmatic questions is considered wicked. Probably one of the principal causes of this difference is that every one is continually being assured by his own experience that, whatever any one may please to say upon the subject, there is a degree of doubtfulness about moral subjects from which it is in vain to try to escape. The very fact that different standards of right and wrong are employed for different purposes by persons who think on such subjects in different spirits, is in itself the strongest possible evidence of the uncertainty in which the whole matter is wrapped up. Men's consciences, and their habitual ways of using language, will not and cannot be forced to surrender at discretion to any theories whatever. In regard to dogmas, on the other hand, as their reception rests, or is supposed to rest, exclusively upon evidence and authority, a doubt of the dogma is, in fact, a doubt of the authority which asserts its truth; and a doubt upon one point involves a doubt on all.

This consideration will no doubt explain, at least to some extent, what is nevertheless a great anomaly. It does not, however, deprive of its force an observation which naturally suggests itself to any one who appreciates the degree in which morals are, in fact, doubtful, and the slightness of the importance which common feeling attributes to that fact. When the matter is properly considered, it certainly appears as if the observation of Bossuet with which we began this article ought to be inverted. It would seem that we ought to say, not, If dogmas are laid open to dispute we shall have to tolerate a difference in morals; but, Since differences of such vast importance are and must be tolerated even in regard to morals, and produce so

little real inconvenience, why need you be so much alarmed at the prospect of a permitted difference as to dogmas? Since the Ten Commandments are so vague and general, and since your own divines who have to interpret them arrive at such extremely different results, why are you so much horrified at a similar vagueness in the Creed, and at a similar degree of diversity in the detailed application of its general doctrines? If members of one communion can agree to differ on the question whether mere abstinence from sin, produced by fear of punishment, and altogether unaccompanied by anything which can be called love of God, is or is not sufficient for salvation, why should they not agree to differ on the question whether any, and which, of the various interpretations of "This is my body" is the true one? The only answer which can possibly be given to this is that the Church (whatever that may mean) has, as a fact, decided one set of questions and not the other; and this answer clearly proves that the utmost result which a system of ecclesiastical authority can produce is obedience, and such a degree of unity of belief as the habitual profession of a common creed insensibly produces. The theory always is that the Church is the guardian of a tradition which was originally divinely revealed, and that it only declares from time to time what its doctrines are, without making new ones. The divergency between moralists shows that, upon moral questions at all events, there is no such thing as a uniform tradition. The degree of authority which is exercised over them by the Church, and the similarity of doctrine which is thus maintained, prove that the Church exercises a legislative authority over them, and produces thereby a certain uniformity. This shows that such uniformity in morals as does exist is the work of submission to a common legislator, not of consent in a common tradition; and it would be no difficult matter to show that precisely the same process has taken place in the history of dogmas.

In conclusion, we may observe that a curious essay might be written on moral doctrines which have in course of time become obsolete. The theory of persecution, which, as we have shown on a former occasion, was the very corner-stone of Bossuet's whole system; the theory of usury; the theories current in all countries, Protestant and Roman Catholic, as to the proper use of Sunday; the theory as to the moral right of the legislature of a nation to make laws about marriage—all afford illustrations of the general truth that our moral code is by no means final, but is continually undergoing a process of reconstruction. If this fact is fully appreciated, and connected with its inevitable consequences, it will be found to throw a flood of light on all the questions which have been, and are still, so vehemently agitated as to the real meaning of the distinction between right and wrong, and the true theory of the importance, the rights and the duties, of conscience.

CHARITY.

IT is often disputed whether charity—in the narrow sense of giving away money to the poor—does, on the whole, more good than harm. We have been warned to refuse money to street beggars until we can reconcile the apparently incompatible pleasures of feeling mean and virtuous. There is an undeniable comfort in sternly repelling a miserable bundle of filthy rags, on grounds of high morality. When we have quenched the instinctive sense of remorse—and nothing is easier to quench than any penitential feeling, if a man will only set his mind to do it—there arises a complex but highly agreeable glow of satisfaction. We are dimly conscious that it is virtuous to be well clothed, to feel a passing sympathy for a beggar, to repress that sympathy on grounds of high public interest, and to devote, or even to intend to devote, the sum saved to some purpose of unquestionable utility. As sympathy may easily become stimulated to excess, and the man who begins by giving helpence to beggars may end as a person of well-known benevolence, or even develop with opportunity into an imprudent Peabody, it is as well to stop in time. The capital of the world would be wasted if this morbid propensity were to be unduly encouraged, and the poorer half of the population demoralized to provide materials for the charity of the rich. Without going to these lengths, promiscuous charity is unquestionably an evil for very obvious reasons to which political economists sometimes give fine names, and really tends to aggravate the disease whose symptoms it attempts to remove. And, to a certain extent, this is true of all charity. In the year 1870—that is, when the millennium has begun—there will be no poverty, and consequently no charity; every labourer will be as much above accepting relief from the poor-rates as a member of Parliament of the present day. Every step towards improving the condition of the poor is a step towards this result, however distant the result may seem to others than the disciples of Dr. Cumming. And, moreover, any measure is efficient in proportion as it tends to expunge charity from our social system. Successful co-operative schemes, or facilities for saving money, do infinitely more good than almost any amount of charity, because they tend towards the discovery of a cure for poverty, instead of diminishing the instantaneous suffering. All this is sufficiently plain; but it seems to countenance one disagreeable inference. It would doubtless be better for mankind, as a whole, if every family were independent, and poverty unknown; if the lowest stratum of society had reached the level already attained in some countries, where land is plentiful and education universal; and, in short, if every peasant had in his pot the proverbial fowl for dinner. But if

seems at first sight as if this advantage were gained at the price of a minor, but not inconsiderable, loss. It is part of the process of levelling, so often denounced, by which the most picturesque elements of society are destroyed. If there is to be no occasion for charity, there will be none for the display of some of the noblest human qualities. We lose the mass of squalid misery of former ages, but we also lose the heroic spirit of self-sacrifice by which it was sometimes alleviated. On the whole, no one can dispute the improvement to society at large; but is not the improvement effected at the cost of the individual? May we not trace a similar process elsewhere? It is a very good thing that we don't burn people alive because they venture to differ with us on certain points of speculative theology; but it may be urged that it is rather a pity that, in losing the martyrdoms, we also lose the martyrs. A martyr was, after all, a very picturesque object. When a gentleman was eaten by lions because he would not assert some proposition which he did not believe, it was a great pity that such a fine fellow should be eaten, but it was some satisfaction to make it plain that such noble qualities existed. Arguments grow languid, and our belief in the sincerity of the disputants becomes faint, with the disappearance of this crucial test. A man, it is true, has less motive for lying, but we are also less sure that he is speaking the truth. When nobody burns or is burnt, we are not quite certain that the battle is in earnest, and the element of individual heroism disappears from a purely paper warfare. Or, to take another instance, when there are no oppressed nationalities, what shall we do for the devoted patriot of poets? When there is a Fenian Republic in Ireland a Stephens may still exist, but he will not stir the noble Celtic heart by hurling defiance at the Saxon. When Hungary and Poland have followed the example of Italy, and every separate nation has either become independent, or, what comes to the same thing in the end, been definitely swallowed up by its biggest neighbour, the most striking of all the motives of historical pictures will have become obsolete. No one will be able to repeat the part of William Tell, or Kossuth, or Garibaldi, or Washington; and our descendants will have to work up for poetical purposes the old types which are already worn to rags. Even the optimists who believe in the indefinite progress of the human race must admit that every victory over evil makes the glory of the conqueror less attainable for the future. In fact, we have to contemplate that picture which seems to be the result of so many Utopias, when all the human race will be very comfortable and very stupid; when nobody will be either starving or charitable, or oppressed or patriotic, or in any way suffering from any serious evil, or struggling heroically against it.

If this were so—and many philosophers seem to accept it as probable—we should easily console ourselves by the thought that any Utopian state of affairs is a good long way off. There is no danger of the world becoming so happy and peaceable and free from all evil that the active faculties will be starved for want of a due sphere of operations. It is highly probable that our coal will come to an end before our grievances, and that there may still be work for a generation or two of heroes. But without resorting to this topic of consolation, we may dispute the accuracy of the logical inferences. There is some reason for thinking that the disappearance at once of martyrs and martyrdom is not a balance between good and evil, but a clear gain on both sides. So long as people are ready to burn their neighbours for heresy, it is of course desirable that there should be a supply of fuel. Martyrs discharge a most necessary function; but it is also to be remembered that such evils as persecution invariably react even upon those who encounter them. The martyr of painters and poets is a very picturesque object; but there is a good deal to be said against him in practical life. It is pretty certain, for example, that he is ready to be a persecutor in a different position. He is probably narrow-minded and obstinate, for the opinions for which he is burnt will certainly seem to him to be of paramount importance, and most martyrs have been burnt upon questions which are really very trifling. Moreover, being a martyr is not so difficult as it looks. People who live in the times when burning is in fashion get to be careless of their own lives, as well as of their neighbours'; and the highly sensitive gentleman who has the strongest possible objection to being hanged is probably a braver man than the ruffian who goes to execution whistling a lively tune. In short, without carrying out the whole argument of a devil's advocate, we may say that martyrs were doubtless the best men of their time, but that the victims were injured by the prevailing tendencies as well as the persecutors; and that, stripped of the conventional halo, most martyrs have probably been sour, wrong-headed men, with a great deal of conceit, and the average amount of courage; besides which, a good many of them couldn't help it. Dealing with patriots in the same spirit, we might pick holes in their coat with equal facility. They were on the side which we think right, and therefore we fall down and worship them; but we shall generally be disappointed when we look at them too closely, and shall find that they were just as ready to cut the throats of anybody who disagreed with them as their oppressors; and that a ferocious ruffian might be exalted into a hero, because he happened to back the weaker side. That there is a beautiful simplicity about the rack and the axe of ancient times, which enables us to sympathize with their victims, is true. We can all feel for a man who would be tortured to death rather than tell a lie; but it is not quite so plain that people who lived in rougher times were really more heroic or more truth-telling; they had only greater opportunities for making their heroism intelligible at a glance to the popular mind.

To return to the question of charity, we may find some reasons

here too for a similar view. The merit of charity consists in the self-denial which it imposes for the benefit of other persons. Now there is no reason to suppose that, short of the millennium, there will be any falling off in the demand for this quality. In some respects it is likely to increase, for every improvement in civilization tends to make each man more dependent upon his neighbours. So far as we can look forwards, we see indefinite opportunities for improving society, and the sensibility to evils seems to grow even faster than our power of dealing with them. The difference, which leads to an apparent diminution of the room for charitable effort, is merely that there is not so large a class of persons as formerly absolutely dependent upon charity. Now if, in some future time, such a class should be absolutely extinguished, there would be certainly a loss in the picturesque. We should not have the venerable bedesman receiving his daily dole from the hands of pious benevolence, which sounds so pretty in the pages of Sir Walter Scott or mediæval sentimentalists. But here too, when we look at matters prosaically, it seems that the relation of absolute dependence is one which tells badly upon both parties to it. Charitable people have certain faults which are very characteristic. They get to think it right, as well as necessary, that there should be a deal of misery and dependence. They like the recipients of their charity to keep their mouths in the dust and be thankful for what they get. They denounce the ingratitude of the poor, because the poor are illogical enough to think that any gifts which they may receive are only a part discharge of a debt due from society—a view which, however erroneous, is highly natural. They look with suspicion upon any attempt of the miserable to become independent, and accuse them of pride, as if the pride which leads a man to starve rather than beg were not one of the most desirable of moral qualities. They are naturally tempted, in short, to put an absurd value upon the humble-minded person, who takes their gifts as if they came from Providence, in comparison with the man to whom they are bitter and disagreeable. Every patron is inevitably inclined to get something for his patronage, and to take for his ideal a humility which has in it something rather grovelling; moreover, he looks upon the poverty which provides him with a field for the exercise of a virtue as a necessary and ultimate arrangement, and is induced to take that view of human affairs which represents asceticism as in itself an object instead of a means to an end. Now these temptations disappear in proportion as the most picturesque forms of charity become obsolete; and there is some reason for hoping that, as for munificent patrons we substitute mere assistance to poorer but independent brethren, we may keep the essence of charity whilst losing some of the poetical adjuncts.

THE PARIS EXHIBITION.

THE House of Commons has resolved itself into an indignation meeting; not about the Reform Resolutions, or the crew of the *Tornado*, or Mr. Beales's usurpation of the Prefecture of London, but upon a far smaller grievance. We have found out that in the Great Paris Exhibition we have been unmistakably and irretrievably "done." The phrase is vulgar enough, but dirty things can only be described by shabby language. There is nothing so irritating as being thoroughly overreached; but the irritation is in inverse proportion to the magnitude and importance of the cheating process. There is something of dignity in the attitude of a great country being worsted in a seven years' war, or being foiled in a protracted campaign of diplomacy, or having its capital sacked and losing half its provinces. A victim often acquires a melancholy but something of a superb importance by losing his tens of thousands, like a man and a merchant prince, to some gigantic swindle; but to have one's plate-basket carried off by a respectable but fictitious plumber, or to be done out of five shillings by a smug sham missionary with a little red book and a neat suit of rusty black, stirs the bile to its lowest depths. This is just the attitude of the British nation. The French Commissioners and the Executive of the English Commission have been one too many for the British Empire. *Contabit vacuus*; but our song is a dismal shriek. There is not the slightest attempt at a grin as we acknowledge that we have nothing to do but abide it. We are, as was said in Parliament, "in for it"; we own that we must pay, and we make no manner of difficulty about an open confession of our intense disgust, and do not attempt to conceal our wry faces. The situation, as they say, is this:—We are done out of 150,000*l.*, and nobody ventures to say how much more; and our commercial credit, or our word, or our vanity, is pledged to pay it, and pay we must. It is a debt of honour. We gave, or are supposed to have given, somebody or some thing, some committee or some person, some anonymous and impalpable essence called "an Executive," power to pledge us to some unknown scheme, and we have now got to back our credit. We signed certain blank bills, and we start with amazement at finding they have been filled up by nobody knows who with the modest cypher of 150,000*l.*; and, worst of all, there is some more of our paper out floating about Paris which has not been presented. No doubt this is, as Mr. Disraeli used to say, only a fleabite to this great and glorious country; but it is because it is a fleabite that we are mad with rage and humiliation. The *pulex domesticus* is provoking just because it is so contemptible. We have hunted the little wretch through cranny and chink for many a year, but never caught this greatest plague

of life. We got red and angry in 1851; in 1862 we were perfectly wealed and seamed with nasty ugly swellings; and we have been for the last fifteen or sixteen years from time to time pricked and bitten by the active and gregarious hoppers of South Kensington and the Science and Art Department, and at last we are what the House of Commons showed itself to be on Wednesday morning.

One hundred and fifty thousand pounds for the expenses of the English Department of the Great French International Exhibition to be opened on the 1st of April—the most suitable day of the year; and here on the 20th of February we get the first inkling that we had incurred a penny of this neat little debt. And of course nobody knows how we ran up this small amount, or who ordered the goods. We have had no estimate, no bill of parcels, no advice of the consignment; we entered into no contract; we have nothing to show for it; not a scrap of authority given to, or received by, anybody is producible. The late Government is not responsible; the present Government is not responsible. Earl Granville, the last President, does not say whether he did or did not sanction the *carte blanche* which, it seems, was given to somebody by somebody; the Duke of Buckingham tells us that his first and only knowledge of the *carte* is when it turns up anything but *blanche*. The Commissioners, a hundred and fifty strong, have never met, and only find themselves committed. The Prince of Wales, the President of this great Commission, once summoned his colleagues to listen for ten minutes to a very short paper, which with masterly reticence said nothing—at least about money matters. And here all our knowledge ends. From this point we plunge into the vague regions of conjecture and the immensity of speculation. Is it, so the horrid whisper runs, another and more amazing experience of South Kensington and “the Department”? Is it the old story of the Dilkosha magnified and transcendentized to the most imposing dimensions? Dare we hint to ourselves the ineffable Tetragrammaton? Can it be our own Cole C.B.? We hardly think it. We are slow to believe that any one little head—a very little head indeed—has contrived this last and most stupendous job. To be sure there are antecedents which look suspicious. The Old Man of the Mountains is not likely to let go his hold. The South Kensington Science and Art Department has never shown any signs of relaxing its tenacious grasp on the British Treasury. Scientific departments must, like Satan, find some work to do. It will never do to be idle, because idleness means a termination of salary. And there are too many superintendents and secretaries, and clerks and commissioners, and experts and committees of inquiry and correspondence, too much pay and patronage in existence, to afford to have, or at least to seem to have, nothing to do. Great Exhibitions, like Joint-Stock Companies, are an invention of the modern school of *chevaliers d'industrie*. As promoters are a recognised class in the purlieux of Capel Court, so the jackals of Science and Art must always have an International Exhibition past, present, or to come. What with preparing for the next Exhibition, and organizing the extant Exhibition, and winding up the last Exhibition, the staff of secretaries and contractors and designers, the correspondence and the schemes and the plans and the programmes, the striking of juries and the awards of juries, may keep up a pretty constant and profitable stroke of work, and a very regular salary. Four or five years, which is about the cycle of an International, soon comes round; and it would be very bad management indeed if the officials of 1862 have not contrived to draw their pay up to 1867, and they will be still more stupid if they do not manage to spread the work, to say nothing of the stipends, for this Paris Exhibition well into the next decade.

This consideration—though it sufficiently suggests the *raison d'être* of International Exhibitions in general, and also offers ground for the solid expectation that so long as jobs are to be paid for, and “an Executive” is to be salaried, an International Exhibition, like that charity of which it is the highest type, will never fail—scarcely accounts for this particular matter of the 150,000*l.* Here impenetrable darkness veils the great secret. Certain conditions have hitherto existed between the Governments which have set up International Exhibitions and the foreign Governments which contribute to International Exhibitions. Stated roughly, the case is that of a host and his guests. An invitation is given and accepted, and it is generally understood that the host finds not only house-room, but table, lights, attendance, food, and wines. It is a dinner-party, not a picnic. This was the case with our Exhibitions of 1851 and 1862, and the French Exhibition of 1855. Now we are told that the French Emperor, or the French Commissioners, “thought fit to change the conditions”; and so, after we had accepted the courteous invitation of the good city of Paris for the great banquet of All Fools’ Day, we found out that we and all other strangers were required to bring our own spoons and forks and chairs and tables, and plates and dishes, and above all our *menu*—not excluding the *poisson d'avril*. In other words it was to be a picnic, not a dinner. Well, as Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer says, this may be a great bore, but we are “in for it.” It would be very discourteous and rude to back out of it now. We went in blindfold, and we must not mind the buffets. “No one is more annoyed” than the purse-bearer, but he must fork out. Mr. Hunt describes, with something like the grim pleasantry of a man who smiles serenely after his pocket has been picked, the successive phases of temper which he passed through as the fatal bills came in. Surprise at the audacity of the Artful Dodger was succeeded by indignation; then

he got to protestation; and he has been for some time ineffectually endeavouring to subside into Christian resignation. We have not got to this yet. The wound is too green, and so are we. We have only arrived at the earlier and untoward stage of a most Pagan and savage ill-temper, and in this wretched frame of mind all that we can do is and must be very undignified. We can only rush about sputtering and muttering, and calling heaven and earth to witness how we have been taken in. With inarticulate moans and hoarse shrieks we go about scolding, and, as the boys say, jawing. What were the old conditions? What are the new conditions? Who changed this? Who imposed that? Who accepted these conditions? Where is the correspondence? What were the communications between France and England? Who was sent over? Who are those “officers attached to the Science and Art Department” who not only made estimates but entered into contracts? Who pledged us and committed us, “before the estimates were completed,” to the simple little fact that we had signed some note for 90,000*l.*, and an unknown sum besides? Well might poor Mr. Hunt be “surprised”; well might he “protest”; but as in another well-known instance, he only got the sorry consolation that he might protest and—be d—d. Now to be told all this does not conduce to heavenly-mindedness, even in Committee of Supply. We want somebody to hang, but we shall be quite sure not to get at him. “The Executive” always knows when to furl sail and keep things snug in squally weather. And “the Executive” also knows that it will all blow over. We are in a vast rage, but we shall soon cool down. The little pirate has only got to run into shallow water, and in a month or so will steal out again, and prey as before on our common sense and our purse. “The Executive” knows how to hold its tongue; the indignation will soon be over past. Indeed, reaction will set in. After Mr. Hunt’s Christian resignation comes a sort of relish, and keen sense of the ridiculous, when we survey our own stupendous folly and the cleverness with which we have been outwitted. We all have a certain sort of admiring sympathy with a first-rate “do.” We chuckle at our Cole, and begin almost to like him. Anybody very great in any way, no matter what, is sure to attract some popularity—of a sort. And perhaps this is quite as well. Over and over again we have owned that South Kensington is one too many for us. The Department is certain to have the best of it. We may wriggle and struggle and scream, but the strong man has us. Cole is the strong man; and, as we have repeatedly said, Fate is Fate, and Cole is Cole.

Not that the whole glory of this last business is due to our native unassisted industry and ingenuity. Paris has profited by South Kensington successes. For beginners, the French Commissioners have made very pretty sharp practice. We cannot help thinking that they must have been put up to this particular dodge by the superior experience of our “Executive.” For, as it stands, Paris will get spent on its *ouvriers* and workmen, in the shape of fittings and supplementary buildings, and parks, and management, and lighting, and watching, and freight, and official houses and official furniture, and additional items, the whole charge of which is going into French pockets—150,000*l.* from England, 40,000*l.* from America, 60,000*l.* from Belgium, 80,000*l.* from Italy, 80,000*l.* from Austria, 120,000*l.* from Prussia. This makes just 530,000*l.*, and if we add the contributions of Egypt, Russia, the English colonies, and other insignificant countries, besides other little pickings and stealings, it is calculated that France will start with more than a million of pounds sterling spent by foreign countries among French workmen before the Exhibition opens. Hospitality certainly pays when it is in this way its own exceeding great reward. In the face of these consoling figures it is nonsense to talk of the French Exhibition being a failure; a Parisian shop is no bad investment which clears 25,000,000 francs before it takes its shutters down. No doubt folly and sham and extravagance will culminate this year. The stupendous absurdity of getting up a vast epitome of mankind in all its political, commercial, social, and ethnological characteristics—with sham Arabs bivouacking on artificial sands, and pasteboard scene-painting of Indian tombs doing duty as engine-houses, and Palais Royal *bayaderes* attitudinizing in Pompeian villas—all done in lath and plaster—is sure to provoke universal contempt. But as this particular Exhibition has its speciality in attempting for the first time a competition in ethical as well as economical productions, we venture to hope that it is not too late to institute a prize, as for the most beneficent and lucrative of co-operative institutions, so for pre-eminence in moral qualities. Arbuthnot, in a celebrated epitaph, commemorated one who, with an inflexible constancy and remarkable uniformity of life, persisted in a certain course of practical virtues, of which matchless impudence formed one. Should such a competition be determined upon, we should like to start a candidate for the prize of insolence. The official, whether London or Paris is to be credited with him, who has let us in for this 150,000*l.* would start with such certainty of success that no other expert in jobbery need apply.

THE OFFICIAL MIND.

MOST professions have their own peculiar attendant disorders, from the painter and his colic downwards. Perhaps the most terrible of all these professional maladies is that which attacks anybody who has the honour of serving the State in the public offices. Just as all the people who live in certain valleys suffer from incurable goitre, so all the people who live on the lofty

heights about Whitehall or Downing Street or Somerset House are similarly afflicted with a mental deformity which, like goitre, is quite painless, but yet is horribly unsightly and horribly inconvenient. The cause is in either case equally inscrutable. All one knows is that, before the most guileless and hopeful of men has been a twelvemonth in these serene official regions, he invariably succumbs to the noisome and pestilent influences of the place, and presently may be seen walking to and fro, in admirable unconsciousness that he has got that mental goitre which, for want of a more distinctive term, we may call the official mind. The symptoms and the degrees of the malady are various. A good deal depends on the department to which the sufferer happens to belong. In the Foreign Office the malady is generally much less strongly developed than in any other branch of the service. Perhaps it reaches the height of virulence and unsightliness in the Admiralty, and next to the Admiralty we should be disposed to place the Poor Law Board, or the Board of Trade. One of the first and most conspicuous symptoms is a profound hatred and contempt for the criticism of the public journals upon all affairs of the department. The writer of a volume of bad poems is not more angry against a critic who has ventured to say that the poems are bad, than the head and the tail of a mismanaged department are against a journalist or public man who ever so mildly hints that the department is mismanaged. It is of no use to insist that after all our antagonist is our helper, and that the critic and the department can only have one end in view—the welfare, namely, and interests of the public. The man suffering from an official mind will die rather than see this. If the complaining person effects any good thing for the public, at all events he shall only reach it over the prostrate carcases of a band of devoted officials. They keep the keys of the public business, like the ancient Pharisees who laboured under a similar disease, and, not entering in themselves, they hinder also them that would enter in. Illustrations of this dismal affection abound only too plentifully. So many official men, so many official minds. If you enter a Government office, *circumspice*, and on every side you are surrounded with sufferers. The departments are perfect hospitals and asylums, all impregnated with evil and infectious elements. Everybody you meet is instantly ready to revile and denounce and sneer at the painful endeavours of the newspapers to get some little daylight shed upon the departmental affairs, and, if the endeavours in this direction have been slightly successful, then to insist that the result of the journalist's labour has been, not daylight at all, but mere moonshine.

One or two conspicuous instances of this miserable malady have lately come before the public eye. The President of the Poor Law Board, for example, in bringing in his Bill a few days ago, showed how very short a time suffices to prostrate even a man of much plain common sense. Mr. Hardy has not been very long in office. And the Bill which he brought in is an uncommonly good Bill. In spite, however, of his Bill being a good one, which he had not to defend either against the press or anybody else, and in spite of the shortness of the interval since he left the fresh air and open plains of unofficial life, he could not resist the temptation of sneering at newspapers, and what is written in them, and the people who write it. Of course he must have known perfectly well, before he took office, that the whole excitement which was forcing on some measure of Workhouse Reform was due to the public journals. But for the newspapers, the cases of Daly, Gibson, and the rest would never have been heard of outside of strictly pauper circles. But for them, those abominable evils which the new Bill is meant to remedy would have gone on, unimproved and not meddled with, for possibly a couple of generations to come. Mr. Hardy must have known this. But disappearance of memory is a familiar symptom of that decay which officialism so uniformly breeds. And Mr. Hardy forgot what he had once known. He spoke of newspaper articles just as if the discovery of all the scandalous abuses of the workhouses had been wholly his own personal achievement; just as if he would have been quite sure to bring in his Bill if none of these articles had ever been written.

A plain man cannot help wondering why it is that Ministers always think it necessary or desirable to take up this silly line. Some bishops and other ecclesiastical dignitaries do the same, it is true, and lose no chance of denouncing the press and all its works as the very root and source of all the ills that afflict our age. There is a difference, however, between the lay and the ecclesiastical dignitary. The latter holds a certain number of distinct opinions, or is supposed to hold them, along with his position. These opinions he may very often find specifically attacked in the newspapers, or if not specifically attacked, at all events assailed by implication and innuendo. He may be very foolish and impolitic for vaguely abusing his adversaries, instead of replying to them and confuting them, but still one can understand why he should feel very cross and very much put out by them. It is not so with a First Lord of the Admiralty, or with a President of the Poor Law Board, or with any other official who is not obliged by his situation to hold certain tenets, or else be thought hypocritical and out of his right place. If one were to go to Mr. Hardy or the Duke of Somerset, and point out that something was going wrong on his estate, or in his kitchen or wine-cellar, either of them would undoubtedly be very much obliged to you in case your warning proved to be well-founded. Certainly, neither Mr. Hardy nor the Duke nor Sir John Pakington would think it becoming or useful, while repairing the mischief of which one had given information, to keep up all the time

a fractious growl of indignation and contempt against the informant. On the contrary, they would feel rather in the debt of the informant than otherwise. In private life all this is taken for granted. But in the official world the result is quite different, and unaccountably different, if we do not perceive that human nature gets coated over in the public service with a thick, strange, impenetrable growth that renders it entirely inaccessible to common motives. A public writer informs the Poor Law Board that there is gross negligence and inhumanity in the treatment of sick paupers. The Board instantly conceive a deadly hatred against him for this friendly act. He persists. Other people take it up. At length the dead weight of official resistance yields a little; a slight instalment of reform is conceded; the maladministration and inhumanity are a little diminished. But the resentment of the department is implacable. Its chief, while expounding the state of things which has given rise to his reform—about one half as effectively as the press had expounded and enforced it before him—denounces the very information which first fired the train as “sensational,” and generally overdone and objectionable. Why should he be guilty of a sort of ingratitude, or worse, in a public matter, for services which, if they had concerned himself personally, he would have counted as among the most valuable that could have been conferred? Why should language which, if he had been out of office, he would have called the vigorous utterances of an honest and public-spirited indignation, be vulgarly sneered at, because he is in office, as merely sensational?

It is not only in the State Departments that we find this unfortunate and mischievous malady. It seems to be as strongly developed wherever you have a considerable body of clerks and minor officers gathered together to perform some service for the rest of the public. We have heard a railway porter on the London, Chatham, and Dover line abuse the papers for their comments on that wonderful institution, just in the same spirit in which the Duke of Somerset inveighs against the writers who point out the little defects in the Admiralty administration. The mere fact that the public has some claims on its servants fills those servants with anger and insubordination. Ticket clerks at railway stations, for example, and inspectors, are public servants to all intents and purposes. Yet the public is the very body against whom they are most habitually resentful, and whose convenience they are least ready to consult. The essence of a truly official mind is a splendid contempt for the whole non-official world. Of course, in people born with good tempers this contempt does not wholly extinguish an inborn virtue. But the tendency is always present. The most cheerful of railway inspectors soon mounts the high official horse if you attempt to give yourself airs, to complain of a train being always behind its time, to suggest that the addition of a new train would be a general convenience, to require a foot-warmer at a wrong station, to point out that the fares are inconsistent with one another and much in excess of those charged for the same distances on other lines. The man has no more interest in standing up for bad carriages, dear fares, and unpunctual trains than Mr. Hardy or Mr. Villiers would have in standing up for niggardly Guardians, or the Duke of Somerset in being the champion of a costly and inefficient system in dockyards and at the Admiralty. Only they all insist on identifying themselves with the system whose defects are exposed. Why cannot dukes and railway directors and heads of departments see that the public has its rights, and that the writers who assail abuses are in truth their own friends and the guardians of the public? Perhaps one might as well ask why a man who lives in fens is so foolish as to have the ague?

THE BLUE-BOOK ON RECRUITING.

PEOPLE who read newspapers and periodicals have of late acquired much more knowledge than they ever possessed before of the conditions of military service. A great step is made towards taking interest in a subject when we feel that we begin to know something about it, even if it does not individually concern us. But the army is an institution in which we are all beginning to feel that we have a stake; and there is thus a twofold reason why any trustworthy aids towards forming or revising opinions on the subject should be received with favour. The blue-book issued by the Recruiting Commission would certainly, a few years ago, have been regarded as very heavy reading; but we believe that just now a short review of the matter submitted to the Commission principally in the form of evidence, will be acceptable to our readers, especially when we are expecting the Secretary for War to explain in what manner and in what degree the recommendations of the Commissioners are to take effect. At the head of the Commission was a former Secretary of State for War. Among its members were a former Speaker of the House of Commons, who is also a Yeomanry Colonel, and two or three other civilians; with officers of the regular service and militia of high rank. Their business was to inquire into the operation of the present system of raising troops, and to suggest improvements in it. And it would certainly seem that a plan for reorganizing the army, intimately connected as it must be with the conditions of recruiting, would have formed a legitimate subject of deliberation. The Commission however, as is well known, confined their suggestions to improvements in the existing system; and they might certainly plead, in justification of this unsatisfactory course, that the details given by Lord Harington of the points to which their attention was specially to be

directed seemed to imply that their deliberations were to be restricted to the ground they actually took. But it is unfortunate that they did not take a wider range, and contemplate the full extent of any scheme which the Government may intend to bring forward, because measures which are judicious in one case may be quite inapplicable in another. For instance, the Commissioners are in favour of inducing men to re-enlist after the expiration of their first term; but this is manifestly inconsistent with the formation of a trained reserve, which should be composed of men who have been thoroughly disciplined, yet who are still of effective age. And, again, it was represented by Lord Grey as very desirable that each regiment should be recruited from the locality with which it is connected, the advantage of which would, we think, be very great. But to this it was objected that, if the people of a district became aware that the regiment which relied upon them for recruits was at an unhealthy station, they might refuse to enter its ranks altogether, and so allow its numbers to fall very much below its establishment. This objection is very just on the supposition that the army is liable to colonial service, but otherwise it ceases to apply. It is evident, therefore, that the parts of any proposed system must be considered with reference to the whole, and that an attempt to deal piecemeal with them will lead to blunders. Now what is mainly demanded at present, in any scheme of army reform, is the formation of a reserve. Not only did the Commission fail in this essential particular, but it addressed itself mainly to devising means for inducing old soldiers to re-enlist; which would be, in fact, to sacrifice the reserve to the active army. And as the Commissioners appear to have put their questions with the idea of extracting from the witnesses the means of making the best of the very defective system that now exists, and did not contemplate changes which must, we presume, form part of the Government proposals, their Report is by no means so valuable a guide as it might have been. Nevertheless, it contains many isolated facts and opinions which may assist the reader in coming to a better conclusion than their own.

In 1847 the Limited Enlistment Act now in operation was passed. The Secretary for War was Lord Grey, whose evidence before the Commission is so well considered and complete that it forms a valuable pamphlet on the whole question. He tells us that the object of the Act was to create a greater readiness, especially in the better classes of the peasantry, to enter the army. It was thought that the relations of young men generally opposed their enlistment, because it was like parting with them for life. Therefore, after ten years' service (which it was not considered advisable to prolong, except in the case of non-commissioned officers) the soldier was to be encouraged to enrol himself in the reserve; but this part of the plan was confessedly imperfect, and in great measure failed, as did also the project of instructing the soldier in industrial trades. We know that the abridgment of the period of service has not produced the desired effect, for recruits are more wanted than ever. Nor has it improved the class; for it appears to be generally agreed that recruits are now usually actuated by the prospect of a certain subsistence, of which they were not otherwise assured, or because they have quarrelled with their friends and seek any means of escaping from them, or because their fancy has been attracted by the external show of a military career; and in none of these cases are they likely to be influenced either by the term of service or the prospect of increased advantages—these being, in fact, matters about which they ask no questions. Indeed, it would seem as if most of this desultory and somewhat vagabond class already gravitated naturally towards the army, and any increase in the numbers of recruits must include those of better social position.

Among the reasons adduced for the failure to obtain recruits, one of the chief is the increased demand for labour in almost every department of civil life, and the proportionate rise in wages. A military career now offers no prospects that can compete with those which directly and constantly present themselves to the skilled labourer and intelligent workman. Then there is the prospect of colonial service. "There is nothing," says Lord Grey, "which is so unpopular with the friends of young men (I believe it is not the same case quite with the young men themselves) as the notion of going out to India. There is a belief that it is almost a sentence of death or permanent banishment; they do not like that, and the very large demand upon our force for India now, though probably it is necessary, undoubtedly must have increased the difficulty of filling up the army very much compared to what it was." He describes also the arrangements which he made for reducing the period of service in the West Indies, which had, he says, a very powerful effect in diminishing the apprehension which was felt of being sent there. "Under the old system they went there for ten years or more, and they thought, and thought very truly, that a man's chance of ever coming away was a very small one." Again, a powerful influence is exercised by soldiers discharged after ten years' service, who return dissatisfied with the service, and often destitute, to their native places, and paint its disadvantages, real or supposed, in a style to render it repulsive; and it is easy to imagine how wide may be the circle of prejudice created by each idle and manifestly unprosperous man who devotes his leisure to the narration of his grievances.

The first difficulty we have mentioned the Commissioners propose to meet by an increase of pay and pension during and after the second period of service. And here we are at once forced to remark how unfortunate it is that the Commission did not deal with the question of reconstruction rather than that of mere im-

provement. For, if we are right in assuming that any plan submitted to Parliament must be based on the principle of dividing a single period of enlistment into two parts—the first to be passed in the active force, the second in the reserve—the remedy proposed by the Commissioners is quite inoperative. In fact, the most disappointing circumstance attending the Report is that its proposals are mainly directed to accumulating inducements to re-enlist. It does not contemplate either increase of pay or of bounty, or any condition which would be likely to influence the class of men who now seek the army as a career; and thus a great part of its labours can conduce to no useful result. On the influence which the prospect of exile and loss of health in colonial service exercises on recruiting, so strongly dwelt on by Lord Grey, the Commissioners say nothing, the idea of separating the home from the colonial army having never come within the sphere of their deliberations. Where they really make valuable suggestions is on the subject of improving the condition of the soldier, and thus removing that widespread dissatisfaction which is considered to be so serious an obstacle to recruiting. The remedies for various grievances respecting clothing and stoppages of pay are suggested, and the recommendation that the soldier should receive increased pay for good conduct after two, instead of three, years' service is especially applicable to a shortened period of duty in the active force. An increase of the ration is a judicious recommendation; and the ameliorations indicated by the Commission in the conditions of military duty, by reducing the number of sentinels to the lowest point, are of great importance. To say nothing of the irksomeness of pacing alone for hours on a post, the effect on a man's health of passing every third or fourth night in full uniform in a guard-room, with intervals of sentry duty, is imaginable by every one, and is a main reason why soldiers are worn out earlier than the same class of civilians. Lastly, the Commissioners remark on the disadvantages of retaining men during the winter in the camps, which last week formed the subject of one of our articles.

We anticipate, from the plan of causing men to pass a period of their service in the reserve, a result far beyond the formation of a much-wanted description of force. The influence it would have in obtaining greater numbers and a better class of recruits is strongly shown by some of the evidence given before the Commission. "A good-conduct man," says one witness, speaking of discharged ten years' men, "going away with his two good-conduct badges, can get employment anywhere. . . . the public begin to know what two good-conduct badges mean; and such a man is as certain of employment as anything can be; he has merely to go to the landlord of the estate on which he lives, or what not, and he invariably gets employment." Other evidence shows that a large proportion of discharged soldiers obtain employment in railways with twenty-three to twenty-five shillings a week. "I find," says a railway superintendent, "that they are much better pointsmen and signalmen than ordinary men." But, on the other hand, we are told by the Secretary to the Pensioners' Employment Society that, "in the majority of instances, the private soldier of twenty-one or twenty-four years' service is disqualified, by his age, for every desirable post in the Civil Service, or in public or local establishments. This is not all; most of those men are broken down in health and constitution, and thus incapacitated. Having no trades, they are yet forced to try and do something for an existence; they cannot compete with an ordinary unskilled labourer; and Englishmen, however patriotic, will not employ men who are unable to perform a proper day's work." Here, then, is proof that while a long period of service renders men incapable of maintaining themselves in civil life, where their extreme destitution exercises a most pernicious effect on recruiting, yet men of good character, discharged while still in the prime of life, are certain of obtaining employment in positions of trust. It is a fair and obvious inference, that if men, after a still shorter period of service, should return to civil life in all the vigour of their youth, with certificates of good character acquired in the army, they would enter on their new career with great advantage; and the numerous examples that would be seen in every part of the country of discharged soldiers filling creditable and profitable employments to which their military service had been the passport would cause the service to appear in a light so new and popular as could not fail to attract numerous recruits, and those too of a better class. The militia, who now contribute a considerable proportion of recruits to the army, would begin to perceive the superior advantages and credit of service in a force that entailed no more actual duty than their own. With respect to the amount of pay to be given to soldiers of the reserve, we see no reason to dissent from the opinion of one of the witnesses, Major Knight, who considers that their services might be secured by 6*l.* a year without pension. And of course, if many of these men had acquired in the service an industrial trade, the army would contain a new element of prosperity and popularity. Lord Grey, to whose thoughtful evidence we attach great importance, is convinced that this could be done, and quotes the French and American armies in support of his opinion. It would become much more practicable were the suggestion adopted of dispersing the regiments composing our great camps over the country in the winter season. By stationing these, each in the locality with which it was connected, facilities would be given for forming and maintaining the necessary workshops, and enabling men to resume the industrial instruction which the summer exercises in camp would have suspended. In this way, too, most effectual aid might be given to the

machinery for recruiting, which it formed so large a part of the Commissioners' task to consider; for landowners, clergymen, and employers of labour, who are now naturally indisposed to advise well-conducted young men to join the army, because they believe that, while conducting neither to their profit or credit, the service entails the loss of all local connexion, would be the first to use their great influence in recommending a military career if its advantages were thus brought home to them. Lastly, we imagine that the sentiment of aversion to, and jealousy of, a large military force, long popularly ascribed to the British people, and considered as so powerful by the Duke of Wellington that it induced him, in his eagerness to render the army inoffensive, to distribute it in small bodies all over our dominions, thereby greatly diminishing its efficiency, would vanish when contented soldiers were passing every year into the body of the population, and remaining in constant communion with their former comrades.

The moral of the evidence collected by the Commissioners is that isolated facts and suggestions, however plausible, are not to be trusted unless their advantage with reference to a complete plan is made manifest, and that schemes of partial reconstruction will not answer the purpose. The logical sequence of the necessity for a trained reserve is a shortened period of service in the active army; and this implies the separation of the colonial from the home forces. For a great proportion of our military expenditure is now incurred for transport; and to multiply the reliefs of troops to four times their present number would represent an outlay which might be much better bestowed in giving additional pay for such colonial service as ought fairly to be provided for by the Home Government. The relief of each soldier in India involves a cost in transport, the Commissioners say, of 56*l.* Bearing this in mind, and also remembering that all pensions, except for wounds and gallant service, might be abolished along with additional pay for long service, and that all expenses entailed by soldiers' marriages might be saved, it would appear that our army might be placed on an efficient footing without much additional expense to the country. However this may be, we trust that no consideration will be allowed to obstruct the development of a complete and satisfactory scheme. There have been times when Cabinets were bound to make their designs conform to the means they could venture to demand; but what is wanted now is efficiency rather than economy, and to sacrifice a good plan of army reform to parsimonious considerations would be a serious and unpardonable error. But a few days will probably show how far the intentions of the Government correspond with the views we have expressed.

THE BISHOPS ON CEREMONIALISM.

SO long as the controversy about a more splendid or more sordid Church service confined itself to an abstract discussion, it was but a very dry bone to wrangle about. Viewed either purely on its inherent merits, or surveyed only under its historical aspect, there was nearly as much to be said on one side as on the other. To all but the technical and legal mind ceremonialism and anti-ceremonialism could produce a justification equally substantial and equally inconclusive. And, even as regards the legal mind, it was six of one and half a dozen of the other whether the chasuble had or had not the law on its side. Eminent counsel have pronounced, with equal certainty and the impartiality of a common assurance, totally opposite opinions. And this opposition is precisely what the historical facts of the case would have led any student to anticipate. The English Reformation—instead of being what prejudice or ignorance is pleased to consider it, a well-considered protest against abuses, and a large well-weighed embodiment of fixed principles—is known to have been an inconsistent, vague, vacillating series of hand-to-mouth expedients, tried in succession by all sorts of people, under all sorts of influences, to meet all manner of fluctuating necessities, by inventing compromises and bargains to suit every passing emergency, the whim of a tyrant, the imbecility of a child, the cupidity of a knave, and the caprice of a woman. The question of ceremonies, because it deals with concrete and material subjects, forcibly illustrates, not only the character—which is no character at all—of the Reformation period, but the whole of our ecclesiastical history since the sixteenth century. Born in a compromise, the Church of England exists, and has succeeded, as a compromise. Its outward aspect faithfully reflects its inward spirit, and neither in form nor substance has it any reason to be ashamed of this. Only let it be confessed. The Ceremonialists have much to say for themselves, because they may point, not only to their famous rubric about the usages of the second year of Edward VI., but to the principle of the thing, to show that there is no argument, as the Puritans very well knew and admitted, for or against the surplice, which is not equally strong for or against the cope. The old and intelligible ground urged by the first Puritans was that any distinction of ministerial dress meant everything. It conceded the principle. On the other hand, as the real thing now wrangled about is the revival of disused vestments and the meaning of them, as well as their form, the anti-Ceremonialists and the more cautious High Churchmen have a very strong ground in their appeal to fact, first that chasubles and incense never have been used in the reformed Church of England, and that it is a matter of policy not to insist upon them, or not to urge them as *de jure* now. All this, *mutatis mutandis*, applies with a sufficiently rough and practical accuracy to doctrine as well as to ceremonial. When

it is pretended that doctrine, so closely akin to the teaching of the Latin Church as to require a theological microscope to detect the faint variety of tissue, is an absolute novelty among English theologians, this can only be said by those who enjoy the fool's paradise of literary and historical ignorance. There never was an hour of the later English Church in which this taunt or boast could not have been, and as a matter of fact has not been, urged, and it is incapable of disproof. Nor is the recent *Eirenicon*, as far as its principle goes, nor again the recent inchoate desire after a general pacification of Christendom, nor the extant attempt to harmonize differences on all sides, a new thing. Now upwards, now downwards, now this side, now that, now east and now west, the path of English Christianity has been an ecliptic, with torrid and frigid tendencies in alternation. All that anybody ought to feel is, that it is better to leave things as they are, because they always have been so. This was the principle of the Gorham judgment; not a very logical, but a very practical, one. If the chaos, which is after all no such bad thing, is ever to take definite form and order, it will be by subtle and gradual and imperceptible influences. A cataclysm and violent interruption of causes working somehow or other steadily enough, though always in the dark, is not to be desired. And an artificial cataclysm, such as the promoters of penal suits against either party desire, is a contradiction in terms. It will remove no evil. When we have got that Free Church of pure Protestantism which the impotent despair of Lord Shaftesbury contemplates, or even the *petite église* of M. Jules Ferrette, when Syrian Jacobites and Scotch Presbyterians meet together, and when the *Directorium* and the *Directory* have kissed each other, what then? Why the English mind and English people will remain much as before. We shall have a very little schism. But the British father of a family will have a Church and will have an Establishment, and in that Established Church there must be room made, as the Bishop of London sensibly enough says, for Dr. Pusey and Dr. Daniel Wilson. It might be well if this lesson of mutual tolerance were more explicitly learnt.

Such tolerance, however, is not one of our middle-class English virtues. During the last few months Ceremonialism has been debated in a very fierce and aggravating way. The leaders in the movement of which the external forms are embodied in incense and chasubles have gone far beyond the innovators of 1842; and they are a very inferior set of minds. Their sole literature is confined to the very husks and rinds of archaeology. They have only carried with them the feminine mind of the Church. It is remarkable that the really great minds of the High Church party have always stood aloof from the revival of excessive Ceremonialism. Dr. Newman, Dr. Pusey, Mr. Keble, the Bishops of Exeter and Oxford, have, though in various degrees, shown a marked disapproval of what has culminated in a district church in Holborn. But what Laud in the plenitude of his power, what Wren and Juxon and Sheldon in the full tide of reaction against Puritanism, never dreamed of doing, has been attempted by the congregations and nameless curates of a few district churches in London. Undeterred by the significant events of 1842, when the late Bishop of London beat a retreat more hasty than dignified from a position which, with his usual precipitancy, he had occupied, the Ceremonialists of 1866 have been gradually innovating on the Church services till the British mind has got fairly frightened. We are only surprised that the explosion was not earlier. The Ceremonialists were over and over again warned of what was sure, sooner or later, to come of their pertinacious and irritating attacks on English prejudice or English tradition. But they persisted in a course which was certain to end in a popular agitation. Utterly careless of general interests, and too conceited and self-reliant to accept advice or to listen to even friendly remonstrance, they thought they were strong enough to reverse English history and to brave English opinion. The consequences are now before them. It is useless to recall the steps which have led to the recent combined *mandement* of the English Bishops. Towards the close of the year, when the silly season had touched its *nadir*, that particularly pleasant-tempered gentleman "S. G. O." favoured the *Times* with one of his well-known letters on a private matter of ancient date which was no concern of his, and of which the result was that he received a stern rebuke for his impertinent interference from the family who alone were interested in it. With that singular mixture of impolicy and candour which belongs to the man of the cloister, Dr. Pusey permitted himself to argue, with an unequal opponent, subjects which, one would have thought, might have been considered too delicate, if not too sacred, for public discussion in a newspaper. But the floodgates were opened, and from the Confessional to Ritualism the transition was easy. Lord Shaftesbury followed "S. G. O.'s" lead, and believing, or affecting to believe, that education and intelligence had all gone over to Tractarianism, the veteran Head of Protestantism wrote to the *Times*, announcing that only a miracle could save "the doctrine of the Reformation," menaced somewhere in Baldwin's Gardens by an enthusiastic curate in gorgeous apparel.

Lord Shaftesbury's notion of miraculous intervention seems to be that of a Committee of Religious Safety, of which he is to be perpetual Chairman, and so thinks the *Record*. But so do not, for some reason or other, some other influential people. We do not pretend to know how it has come to pass that Lord Shaftesbury is not so popular as he was. The Committee on Ritualism—which means the Committee against Ceremonialism—has thought proper to commit its interests to Mr. Robert Hanbury and Mr. John

Abel Smith; and for some weeks the Evangelical organs have been favouring us with the details of the domestic dispute which has taken place for the honour of heading the protest of the Protestant public against incense, lighted candles, and chasubles. It is not improbable that the cashiering of Lord Shaftesbury was a politic movement on the part of the Committee. There are plenty of churchmen, who have no sympathy with the Ceremonialists, who would be at once repelled by Lord Shaftesbury's leadership; but it remains to be seen whether they have greater confidence in Lord Ebury and Mr. John Abel Smith. It is too much, however, to believe that this Committee has had any real influence on the settlement of the question. The Bishops of London, Oxford, and St. David's had delivered their Charges before the Buckingham Street convocation was formed; and when three such Bishops had pronounced an opinion which was substantially identical on the Ceremonial question, the mind of the Church had been practically declared; and the question might be considered as settled, as far at least as settlement was possible.

The recent Resolution of the Upper House of Convocation, adopted without much difficulty and with a general sanction by the Lower House, is in fact only a condensed epitome of the course indicated by the three influential Bishops whose Charges we have just mentioned. The Resolution follows precedent. We know that in fact the safe and prudent course of Archbishop Howley and the English Bishops, in 1842, not only allayed public discontent, but secured the peace of the Church for many years. The same result will probably follow in the present emergency. The Bishops, as Bishops, have come forward, not as the representatives of their own private opinions, but they claim a position analogous to that occupied by the Judges whose business it is to give a legal interpretation, not private glosses of a statute. The framers of the present Prayer Book could not but foresee that what is now happening would be sure some day or other to happen. "Doubts" must sooner or later arise "in the use and practice of the same"; and a provision for meeting the case is made in the Act of Uniformity. On this provision the Bishops now fall back; and their strength is that it is a legal provision, a fair provision, and a reasonable provision. It does not mean, because it cannot mean, either that there are to be twenty-six co-ordinate authorities all interpreting a disputed point in conflicting decisions, or that in the two Archbishops is vested a paramount authority of deciding in possibly two discordant judgments. What the reference to the Bishop of the diocese and the appeal to the Archbishop announces is a decision "not contrary to anything contained in this Book." This can only be arrived at by the Bishop deciding, not in his back-parlour, or according to his lights great or small, but upon legal grounds, arrived at in some legal way. How the Bishops are to inform themselves must be left to the Bishops to discover. Sensible and moderate people will be quite content to leave this matter to the Bishops themselves. Difficulties enough will they have. When appealed to by dissident parishes and congregations their course is sufficiently clear; but to intervene, if they intend to intervene, without being appealed to either by minister or people, is another affair. Their Resolution may be used in far Carlisle as an engine of mischievous interference. In Salisbury it may remain a dead letter; and in London it is sure to provoke censure and strife in proportion to the moderation with which it may be expected to be employed. To all this the Bishops—who do not seem, as the Bishop of St. David's informs us, to have spent much time on elaborating it—must have made up their minds when they passed their hastily drawn Resolution. Be this as it may, they have appealed to an authority which is certainly not *extrajuribus*; the baldest view of a superintendent's office must trust them with the responsibility which they now claim. Till they have failed—and we do not see how they can fail so long as they remember that they are officials and not partisans—we are quite content to let matters stand. An appeal to good sense and good feeling on both sides is seldom made in vain. And at any rate the fussy programme of deputations to Lord Derby, and applications for Royal Commissions, speeches in Parliament, and petitions from all parts of the country, is effectually shelved. Few people will be disposed to call in quacks while the regular practitioners are in consultation; and till the Bishops abandon the case we shall not send either for Lord Shaftesbury or Mr. Hanbury.

TURNPIKES.

II.

WE spoke in a former article of the movement against the Turnpikes which, having begun in the Michaelmas Quarter Sessions for Gloucestershire, seems to be gradually spreading over various parts of the country. Not only have Quarter Sessions spoken in more than one county, but we know of at least one Highway Board which has opened its mouth. And, if we know of one, there must doubtless be others which we do not know of. But it must not be thought that the battle is won. There is not perfect unanimity on the subject throughout the land. The unanimity indeed at Gloucester on the main question was remarkable, perhaps because in Gloucestershire every man had felt the nuisance in his own person. Men were not blind to the real practical difficulties in the way, but no one had a word to say for the turnpikes on their own account. Some one will perhaps say that this is nothing wonderful; that the Gloucestershire magistrates are reasonable two-legged animals, and that no such animal would stand up on his two legs to speak a word for turnpikes in the

abstract. Let us explain to such a caviller that there really are human creatures to whom the British turnpike is very dear for its own sake. We say "for its own sake," to distinguish this remarkable class of men from shrewd fellows here and there who live just out of reach of the local turnpike, and who had rather that their neighbours should pay tolls than that they themselves should pay rates. It is a serious truth that we have known men, not inmates of lunatic asylums, men capable of transacting public and private business on other subjects, to whom the turnpike is really a cherished object, something which it hurts the feelings to hear irreverent innovators speak against. Either the Gloucestershire magistracy contains no men of this curious type, or they felt themselves in such a hopeless minority that they did not venture to open their mouths. The Court is distinctly puzzled as to the best way of dealing with the debt on the different trusts; it has not made up its mind as to the area on which the repair of the roads should be thrown when turnpikes are abolished; but that turnpikes ought to be abolished on the first opportunity no Gloucestershire magistrate seems to doubt.

The case of turnpike-roads is in itself a simple one. At common law every parish is bound to maintain its own roads. In the days when all traffic was by road, the parishes through which certain great lines of traffic ran were utterly unable to maintain their roads. It was not just, nor indeed possible, that the high road from London to Manchester should be maintained at the cost of the parishes through which it happened to run. A system of tolls was therefore devised by which the cost of repairing such roads was thrown on those who used the road. Nothing could be more just under the circumstances. But now that all the main traffic goes by railway and little beyond local traffic goes by road, the circumstances are changed, and what was just then ceases to be just now. A road is now used almost wholly by the inhabitants of the district through which it passes; the proportion of strangers who use it is so small as hardly to be worth considering; it is in any case kept up by local contributions; the only question is whether those contributions shall take the convenient form of rates or the inconvenient form of tolls. Such is the plain state of the case; but all sorts of odd and irrelevant answers are sometimes made. We are told, as a great principle of equity, that those who use roads ought to pay for them; we are told that commercial travellers use the roads, that local brewers use them and cut them up with heavy waggons; we are told with the greatest solemnity that, if turnpikes are taken away, an additional burden will be laid upon the land, that the turnpike is one of the constitutional bulwarks of the agricultural interest against the commercial. We are not joking or romancing; we have heard arguments like these advanced in sober earnest. Such objectors forget that, if their argument proves anything, it proves that there should be none but turnpike-roads, and those with turnpikes at frequent and regular intervals. There is no other means of insuring that the roads shall be kept up only by those who use them. It is clear that at present a man who travels on a parish road beyond his own parish sets aside the great law that those who use the road should pay for it. As for commercial travellers, they now go mainly by railway; still they do go to some extent by road. But the present system does not provide any absolute security for catching the commercial traveller. Like other people, he is caught or not caught, just as may happen. Like other people, he may in one place go a great many miles without paying, and in another be made to pay very often within a few miles. Nay, there is nothing to hinder a commercial traveller from travelling, if his route admits it, on a parish road; that is, all commercial as he is, he may use, if it suits him, without paying a farthing, a road kept up wholly at the expense of the landed interest. As for the local brewers, though a brewer is commercial, yet he pays rates, and we strongly suspect that whatever sums he may lay out in the form of turnpikes he contrives to make come in the end out of the pockets of his customers, who probably chiefly belong to the landed interest. A brewer too may, if it suits him, use a parish road, and, like the commercial traveller, he may snap his fingers at the eternal law which decrees that those only who use the road ought to pay for the road. Brewers too are not the only people who have heavy waggons, or whose wheels do damage to roads for which they do not pay. We think that we have before now seen turnpike roads pretty severely cut up by farmers' carts and waggons going distances which did not make them liable to toll. Of course the plain truth is that no legislation can meet every conceivable case, or can get rid of every theoretical anomaly or injustice which an ingenious man's brain may think of. And of course, so far as the objections prove anything, they prove too much, by proving that all parish roads should be made turnpike. And really, when we hear talk about sacrificing the agricultural interest to the commercial, we do seem to have got back to the days before Kronos and the Moon. Roads, by the common law of England, are looked on as a common advantage, to be kept up by the community for the use of the community. Turnpike tolls are simply a special aid granted under certain special circumstances, and now that those circumstances have ceased to exist, the special aid ought to be withdrawn.

In fact, any such free gifts to commercial travellers, brewers, corn-dealers, and the like, are fully counterbalanced by the mere annoyance of the turnpike-gates, and by the expensive and wasteful way in which the tolls are necessarily collected. The erection and repairs of buildings, the profits of the collectors, and all the little ins and outs of a system of toll-letting, are a source of expense which it was wise to incur when a four-in-hand coach

went by every quarter of an hour, but which is ludicrously cumbersome and costly when the object is simply to catch an occasional commercial traveller.

The substitute for turnpikes is perhaps less clear than the necessity for turnpike abolition. The Gloucestershire magistrates, unanymous against the turnpikes, were greatly divided on this head, and in the end agreed to leave details to the wisdom of Parliament. What is the area to be on which the repair of the roads shall be thrown for the future? Shall it be the county, or the parish, or what? It strikes us that whenever turnpikes are got rid of, the whole system of highway administration will have to be reconsidered. To keep up two descriptions of roads, as at present, is cumbersome and expensive. At present the turnpike roads have one set of governors, clerks, and surveyors, the other highways have another set. Now surely the same board and the same officers may very well do for both. And yet we might hesitate before we deposed the present bodies of turnpike-trustees in favour of the present highway-boards. The turnpike-trustees commonly consist of the magistrates and of other persons having the magistrate's qualification. The highway-boards consist of the magistrates and of the elected waywardens, who are commonly farmers. The turnpike-trusts therefore consist largely of a most useful class of men who are all but shut out from the highway-boards, namely men of higher position and education than farmers, but who are not on the commission of the peace. It is only a few exceptionally enlightened parishes that will ever choose as waywarden any one who makes any approach to the character of a gentleman. The members of a turnpike-trust are to a great extent men who make more or less claim to that character. It would be a great pity if the abolition of turnpikes carried with it the entire exclusion from highway administration of all persons who are neither farmers nor justices of the peace.

Another point to be considered is the utter isolation of the present managing boards, both of turnpikes and of parish roads. Each trust, each highway-board, is perfectly independent of its neighbours; each trust may indeed often be looked on as in some sort hostile to its neighbours. There is no kind of intercommunion, nor is there, as in the case of the Boards of Guardians, any sort of common supervision by a higher authority. This surely is an evil. In getting rid of turnpikes, it would be well to introduce some system of common operation and supervision which shall at least extend over a whole county.

And now we come to the last, but by no means the least important, consideration. The main difficulty in the way of getting rid of turnpikes is produced by the fact that the turnpike-tolls have, after all, not been enough to provide for the maintenance and improvement of the turnpike-roads. Most turnpike-trusts have shown that great mark of civilization which consists in getting into debt. Like the Ottoman Empire and the Kingdom of Greece, they have interest to pay to the public creditor, and sometimes they find it no easy work to pay it. We once knew a road which the parishes repaired, while the tolls were mortgaged to pay the interest of the debt. These debts must in any case be paid somehow; but how? A pamphlet before us suggests that the repairs should be at once thrown on the parishes, while the gates and tolls should be kept up for the sole purpose of paying off debts. This is a cumbersome way of doing things. It is in fact to introduce everywhere the exceptional state of things which we have just described, that of making people pay tolls and rates at once, which those who have gone through the process know to be the most *ruining* state of things of all. A far better scheme is one which is being proposed in several quarters—that of paying off the debts by a special county-rate. Along with the payment of the debts, provision must be made for compensation to the clerks and surveyors of the present turnpike-trusts, who would be thrown out of employment by their abolition. It is really wonderful by how small a rate all these burdens could be got rid of. There is no more fertile subject for declamation than county expenditure, yet it is amazing what large sums can be raised by a very small rate. A farthing or halfpenny rate quarterly does great things when spread over a whole shire. A yearly rate of two-pence or three-pence would extinguish the turnpike debts of a large county in some dozen or fourteen years. And such a rate, special, retrospective, made mainly to defray the cost of permanent improvements, ought not to fall wholly on the occupier. In the proposal now before us, a memorial sent by a highway-board to the Home Secretary, the scheme is that "of the special county rate two-thirds should be repaid to the tenant by the landlord." Surely even the oppressed landed interest need not shrink at such a fleabite as this, for its own great and lasting advantage, even though a stray commercial traveller may now and then creep in unawares to share the benefits of the change.

PICTURES OF THE YEAR.

II.

ART is always tending to ideals, and when an artist's ideal is a new one he is said to be original, and praised for his power of conception, or else abused for his heresy and eccentricity. But as time runs on, these new ideals become old, and then they pass into the category of conventionalisms. Lovers of art who appreciate genius may expose themselves to the accusation of a frivolous desire for novelties by the ready welcome they give to every original thought, and the coldness with which they regard every repetition of it. But the desire for novelty in the fine arts is not frivolous, for it is the desire for health and life. We have a certain

respect for Mr. Burne Jones, as a man of powerful though morbid genius, but we have little respect for his imitators. Mr. Burne Jones was, we believe, the first artist who introduced us to a very peculiar type of womanhood which is now only too familiar to all who frequent the Exhibitions. A low forehead, an ill-favoured and ill-tempered face, hair *bouriffe*, an ungainly attitude, and a badly-fitting, awkward gown, are the principal marks by which this unpleasant personage is to be recognised. It is possible that very deep meanings may be hidden under these somewhat repulsive externals, but the lesson, whatever it may be, has been so often repeated that by this time such of us as are capable of profiting by it must have already done so, whilst the hopelessness of elevating the commonplace public is now sufficiently proved. Disagreeable women in real life usually lay claim to loftier qualities than those possessed by pleasant ones, and these awful daughters of genius look from their frames with airs of disdain on their better-tempered and prettier sisters. The most remarkable lady of this class is Mr. Robert Bateman's "Isabella," in the Dudley Gallery. It is an illustration of the old story of the pot of basil, and the ugliest we ever saw. The face of Isabella, especially about the mouth, reaches an ideal of hideousness which gives a strong impression of artistic power; to make so foul a face as that, without resorting to deformity or caricature, was a stroke of genius. Another picture by Mr. Bateman in the same gallery, called "Heavily hangs the Tiger Lily," gives us a less striking though almost equally characteristic example of the personage whom we intend to call the Loathly Lady. She has red hair and a blue dress, and is seated in a stone chair, meditating; the tiger lily hangs at her left. "Myrtle Blossoms," by Mr. Simeon Solomon, is rather a fine example of the school. The lady, though of the Loathly type, is very skilfully painted; but the myrtle blossoms behind her, however useful in giving a title to the picture, are not advantageous to it as a composition. One twig of myrtle is placed on each side of the lady's head, and seems to grow out of her shoulder. Other conspicuous examples of the Loathly Lady are Mr. Knewstubb's head, in Mr. Gambart's gallery, with the appended quotation—

Not a sunbeam that might pass
Through the cloud that was her hair;

Mr. Armstrong's "Autumn Flowers," in the same gallery; and Mr. Edward Clifford's contributions to the Dudley—three studies of a head, and a finished water-colour picture with the extract,

She is more strong than death,
Being strong as love.

Mr. Robert Bateman, again, does justice to the type he admires in "My Lady" (Dudley Gallery); and Miss Marie Spartali, in her "Corinna," gives us once more the tiresome old ugly face, and the red disorderly hair. The artistic merits of some of these performances do not compensate for the worn-out and wearisome idea. This ugly woman, under whatever aspect, has become hateful to us, and the best that can be hoped for now is her exclusion from the Exhibitions. No work of which she is the heroine ought to be admitted, however skilfully it may be wrought, into an exhibition on the whole so interesting and attractive as the Dudley Gallery. The public has seen quite enough of her, and the artists who so assiduously represent her might employ their abilities, which in some instances are considerable, on subjects of fresher interest and happier motive.

Artists who paint the naked figure are now so rare in this country that a certain honour is due even to the attempt. Beyond this little is to be said in favour of "The Tribunal of the Inquisition," by M. Legros, in the French Gallery. Three inquisitors are seated on a bench, each holding a book. Two naked prisoners are on their knees before the inquisitors, and as their wrists are fastened behind them the attitude is constrained and painful to look upon, so that the free beauty of the naked figure is sacrificed. Indeed, the nudity of these figures was not decided upon for the expression of grace or strength, but of helplessness. The stiff and awkward position of the prisoners was chosen, no doubt, for the same reason, and a moral force is thus given to the work which may fairly be set against its weakness in artistic arrangement. But the picture is not desirable as a work of art. Its colour is cold and poor, and its drawing, though tolerably correct, by no means faultless. Such art is preferable to the vulgar dash of some of our popular costume-painters, for, though not beautiful, it is at least serious; but it fails in one of the great aims of art—it does not give pleasure. It might have a possible utility in illustrating some Protestant lecture, but is too painful and ugly to be hung on the wall of a room.

Mr. Guido Bach has sent two clever naked figures to the Institute of Water-Colour Painters—"Hylas," and "The Fisher." The movement in the "Hylas" is fine; he is on a slope of rock, nymphs in the water are drawing him down, one by the belt, another by the leg, and there is much grace and life in the whole group. "The Fisher," an illustration of Goethe,

Half drew she in—half fell he in,

is tenderer in treatment. The young man's face is very soft in expression, and not without true poetical feeling; the mermaid's attitude is, of course, one of invitation, but is far from being offensive, as in less delicate hands it might easily have become. In both these sketches the flesh-colour is fine, and the backgrounds, though arbitrary and artificial, sustain the figures artistically.

Mr. Wallis has been fortunate in securing so fine a Gérôme for his Exhibition as the "Marchand d'Habits." An Oriental clothes-dealer is walking in the street, and critical passers-by have stopped to examine a sabre he is offering for sale. There is no diminution

in the artist's extraordinary power as a designer, but we remark with pleasure an unexpected development in colour. The splendid and various hues of the dresses which the old man has for sale are rendered with a degree of brilliance of which we had not believed the artist to be capable. There is not as yet, and there probably never will be, any colour-power in Gérôme complete enough to conceive and execute those extensive harmonies which embrace in perfect accord all the tones in a picture, but he may give us isolated passages of true colour surrounded by spaces of variously neutral hues. Gérôme's other picture in the same gallery, "An Albanian Courser," has neither colour nor light, but the study of form is so subtle and true as to make us almost forget their absence. Of all familiar animals dogs are the most difficult to draw, and this leash of Albanian greyhounds is a miracle of accuracy and finish. As specimens of first-rate still-life painting the arms in both pictures deserve especial attention; the precision with which Gérôme has followed their beautiful curves, especially in the stocks of the muskets, is quite up to his usual thoroughness. The only deduction to be made with reference to these pictures is that they interest neither the intellect nor the feelings, but the eye only, and so far must be considered inferior to the "Morituri," the "Phryne," and other important works. But so far as mere workmanship is concerned, we should be inclined to consider the "Marchand d'Habits" the best work of the artist.

Meissonier's little picture of an artist at his easel (misnamed in Mr. Wallis's catalogue "The Finishing Touch," for the picture before him is not in an advanced stage), is free from that excessive tendency to staccato which sometimes detracts from the merits of the painter. There is a suavity in the handling, and an absence of obtrusiveness in the presentation of objects, which are amongst the rarest and most valuable qualities of art. This unobtrusiveness disposes us to underrate, at first, the quantity of material in the picture. And yet the material is so abundant that an ordinary painter would have fatigued us with so much detail. There is an oak cabinet with a bust on it, a chair with sketches, a table, a picture on the wall, and other things, all carefully and thoroughly painted, yet no more interfering with the living figure than if they had been carelessly sketched.

We are all familiar with the cafés of Cairo, as described to us pictorially by Mr. John Lewis. There is a picture of one by Theodore Frère, in Mr. Wallis's Exhibition, conceived in a different, and even opposite, spirit. The rich detail of Lewis is absent, and in its place we have a homeliness amounting to poverty, and which would be repulsive if it were not compensated for by a powerful effect of light. There is an opening in the dark roof through which we see the deep blue sky. A small black lantern is suspended in the midst. In cool obscurity, at the remote end of the building, a mule is standing near three men, who are talking quietly. Near us two men are playing at draughts, and two others stand watching them. On the right is a very plain staircase, like one in an English cottage, and a man is going upstairs. Instead of the profusion of pretty things usual in such subjects, we have a large common saddle, a scimitar, and a rude musket. The most splendid things in the picture are a gleam of light from the roof, falling near the foot of the stairs, and an open doorway beyond, showing a bit of sky and white building in full sunshine. A man is drawing water from a little well in the interior of the house, but his pitchers are of the colour of unbaked clay. The contrast between Theodore Frère and John Lewis may be best expressed by saying that Frère aims at effective chiaroscuro, and Lewis at object-painting. To most of the attractive points in objects Frère seems to be constitutionally indifferent. Gérôme's works produce rather a similar impression, but this is because the observation in Gérôme is so serenely equable that he does not make points as more excitable painters do. Frère paints no object in perfection, but his work is well arranged, and tells at a distance, which cannot always, or often, be said of pictures by either Gérôme or Lewis.

Another painter who evidently makes chiaroscuro one of his chief aims is M. L. Bonnat. His large picture of "St. Vincent de Paul taking the place of the Galley Slave" was exhibited in last year's Salon, and the work in the present Suffolk Street Exhibition is, as we have already mentioned, a reproduction of it on a reduced scale. Perhaps it would be more accurate to call the larger work the reproduction, as it is probable that this is the original picture. The most obvious fault of Bonnat's manner is a tendency to blackness in the shadows, but notwithstanding this defect there is so much real power in his work that we must henceforth count him as one of the considerable artists of Europe. There is true passion in such painting as this; work of this order is not to be produced at second-hand. One or two critics have called Bonnat conventional and academical because he has mannerism, and his mannerism more nearly approaches that of some old masters, especially the great Spaniards, than the common English mannerisms of to-day. Can they not see the true fire there is in every touch, the tragic solemn feeling, the great tenderness, the mastered and accumulated knowledge? The face and attitude of St. Vincent are full of kindness and courage, and the galley-slaves, if their over-developed muscles are somewhat too anatomical, are something more than studies from naked models. The faults of the work are these two—black shadows, and too much anatomy; but the merits of it take it quite out of the common category of religious pictures for churches. The other picture by the same author, "Neapolitan Peasants before the Farnese Palace, Rome," has more popular qualities. Under the large grated windows of the Palace sit four peasant girls on a stone

ledge, a fifth is standing with a man, and an idle little boy is lying down. There is much imitative skill in the painting of the wall, though that is common enough in these days. The good figure-painting is less common, especially in this country.

M. A. H. Tourrier has pictures in the British Institution and Suffolk Street Exhibitions. In the British Institution his contribution is entitled, "To Arms, the Game Interrupted." Two soldiers in the costume of the seventeenth century are playing at cards on a drum. They have just heard the summons to arms, and their countenances express a lively sense of the necessity for attending to it. In so bad an exhibition as that at the British Institution a picture of this quality acquires a degree of prominence greater than would naturally belong to it if considered with reference to the whole art of the year. It is a clever picture, not without vivacity both in conception and workmanship, but there is not much thought in it. The details are very well done, and textures are well imitated; there is some good still-life painting in the armour, and oak-chest, and drum. A far more original idea is the "Alone" by the same artist, in Suffolk Street. A monk is enjoying a little solitude. He leans against the parapet of a lofty tower and looks down on the world below. This world, for him, consists chiefly of a considerable city whose roofs spread out upon the earth like a scattering of scarlet tiles, out of which rise many towers. A river winds into the distance. A pinnacle and gargoyle belonging to the church of the monastery are visible through the openings of the traceried parapet. The sentiment is not unlike that of Meryon's *Stryge*, that curious etching in which the carved demon on the tower of Notre Dame contemplates the fair city of Paris, and grimly numbers the souls that are lost in it. In M. Tourrier's picture the sentiment, however, is pleasanter, and the monk enjoys the fair prospect in a manner which commands our sympathy. Alone, above the multitude of men, he looks over the fair country beyond the red field of roofs. He is refreshing his eyes with the freedom of far glances, and his mind with undisturbed recollections. M. Tourrier's other picture in Suffolk Street, "The Studio," is also a contemplative picture. An artist has temporarily quitted his easel, and is lounging in an easy chair with his pipe; he has, moreover, a book in his hand, but the book is closed and the painter is looking at his picture. He does not seem quite satisfied; and indeed these intervals of rest and thought are seldom for painters moments of self-congratulation. The work seems bad, no doubt, as most work does to those who have done it; and if tobacco has really any power to soothe, it is well to resort to it now. The painter is exercising a wise forbearance in this temporary idleness; some painters daub out their work at such times, and others drive their brush-handle through the canvass, making holes of no obvious utility, necessitating subsequent repairs. In spite of an extreme sobriety of colour, we like this picture much. The figure and face of the artist are true and pleasing, and the accessories, even to the delicate wreaths of tobacco-smoke, careful and in their place.

The same sobriety, with even greater refinement and closer truth, pleases us in the works of M. Gustave de Jonghe. His "Preparing for the Masquerade" owes its great charm to the nice little girl who is just going to be dressed. She is seated with her mother on an ottoman, and her mother is dressing her hair. The slight elevation of the right eye-brow, so precisely accurate under the circumstances, and so difficult to paint quite rightly, is almost of itself enough to prove great powers of observation, and the favourable impression we received from this picture was strengthened and confirmed by the two others—the "Confessional," and "Devotion." The confessional is placed in a modern French church, probably the Madeleine. There are three ladies, one confessing, another praying with her hand on her face, a third praying with hands clasped and face unveiled; it is this face which constitutes the picture, everything else being subordinate to it. The expression is exceedingly sweet and pious, and the attitude delicately true. In the "Devotion" we have also a prayerful expression, studied, no doubt, from some devout lady in genuine prayer, and remembered afterwards; for no model could look like that.

REVIEWS.

GEORGE THE THIRD'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH LORD NORTH.*

THIS Correspondence, being all on one side, would be more accurately described as the Letters of George III. to Lord North. The lapse of three generations has ripened or dried confidential State communications into materials of history. The King's letters have been consulted by several writers, but they are now for the first time published by a highly competent and judicious editor. Mr. Donne has printed all the letters, without omission or transposition, and he has added a valuable Introduction and a series of explanatory notes. His own view of the King's character is temperate and fair, although he once or twice repeats, without careful examination, supposed proofs of alleged duplicity exhibited to Whig Ministers. It was hardly worth while to quote from the Bedford Correspondence hearsay evidence twice removed of the conjecture of some anonymous courtier:—

* *King George the Third's Correspondence with Lord North, from 1763-83.* Edited by W. Bodham Donne. 2 vols. (Published by permission of the Queen.) London: J. Murray. 1867.

"Sir Lawrence Dundas told the Duke of Bedford that a person he did not name, whom I suppose to be Colonel Graeme, said that he never saw the King so affected as he was at the last great majority of the House of Commons (for the repeal of the Stamp Act, 1766), and that he believed he wished for nothing more than to be able to change the Administration." Yet [adds Mr. Donne] the King's next letter was, "Lord Rockingham, I am much pleased the appearance was so good to-day."

Somebody heard that somebody said that he, the second somebody, believed that the King wished to get rid of Lord Rockingham; and yet, such—as Lord Macaulay used to say—is the inconsistency of human nature, the King wrote Lord Rockingham a civil letter. The second somebody may probably have been in the right, but the unauthenticated echo of his guess is scarcely admissible as historical evidence. In the Introduction, Mr. Donne happily observes that "the praise lavished on George III. frequently wears the aspect of satire; the lampoons and caricatures levelled at him as frequently strike at laudable, amiable, or at least harmless points in his nature." It is, in truth, difficult to regard the old King's sayings and doings with purely serious admiration or disapproval. In Mr. Donne's occasional remarks there is a slightly ironical tone which is naturally suggested by the subject-matter. The letters in the collection are highly amusing, as well as historically valuable. The British lion makes his first appearance in one of them, where the King expresses his confidence that the insolence of France and Spain will at last rouse "the old lion." The King himself possessed, both personally and politically, the entire fearlessness which is traditionally symbolized by the lion. His expressions of contemptuous disbelief in a reported plot to assassinate him are very characteristic. The best chance of a perfect representation of George III.'s virtues and defects was lost when Providence placed him too near in time to Sir Walter Scott to be introduced into the Waverley novels. Neither James I. in the *Fortunes of Nigel*, nor Louis XI. in *Quentin Durward*, would have attracted Scott's humorous sympathy so strongly as the plain, self-satisfied, conscientious, ungrammatical, constitutional despot. No analytic catalogue of his qualities can represent his complex and whimsical personality. The best substitute for a dramatic reproduction of his character is perhaps furnished by his official style. His pertinacity, his activity, his unreasoning acuteness, and his hearty faith in all commonplaces which suited his purpose are fully illustrated in his daily letters to his favourite Minister. Although his sentences are constructed with constant disregard of the rules of syntax, the meaning is almost always clear. If a relative pronoun agrees not with the last substantive, but with some intermediate thought which has not been expressed, the processes of the Royal mind are nevertheless uniformly visible through the transparent confusion of his language. Mr. Donne, though an accomplished critic, sometimes does injustice to a perspicuity of intention which is superficially disguised by a long and disjointed sentence. He professes not to understand a letter written in January 1779,

to remind Lord North that the recess is nearly at an end, consequently there is no time to lose in fixing with the Attorney-General whether Lord Suffolk can be persuaded to remain in his present employment, as also to weigh the inconvenience that may arise if there is no alteration made in the head of the Admiralty Commission, and whether Lord Howe will not, before the expiration of the week, lay the foundation of much altercation for the rest of the Session of Parliament, which a subsequent fulfilling of the promise made him by Lord North, whilst he commanded in America, and renewed through the channel of Lord Clarendon, yet not even at this hour thought of, which to a mind of his delicacy must necessarily give lasting disgust.

In more correct, but not plainer language, the King would have expressed his fear that Lord Howe might join the Opposition, and his belief that the inconvenience might be averted by making him First Lord of the Admiralty in pursuance of Lord North's forgotten promise, afterwards repeated through Lord Clarendon. The omission of an essential verb shows that the King cared more for Lord Howe's support than for the polish of his own epistolary style.

Among other incidental impressions, the letters suggest a feeling of compassion for Lord North, who was fortunately endowed with the easiest of tempers. In later years George III. was not quite so restless, and perhaps he may not have found it easy to interfere incessantly with Pitt's conduct of affairs; but in the second decade of his reign he had mastered the details of his profession, and his appetite for business had not been satiated by indulgence. His Minister must often have felt like a housemaid who is incessantly followed up and down stairs by a notable and garrulous mistress. Every day, and all day, the King is as eager to give instructions as to hear the latest news. In later times the newspaper reporters have relieved Prime Ministers from the irksome duty of providing summaries of the debates and divisions. Even after he had completed his Parliamentary report, Lord North was never safe from a summons to talk the debate over at the palace. The King indeed never troubled himself about the arguments or eloquence of either party, but he insisted on knowing whether the Opposition had been unusually offensive, and he required his own adherents, in and out of office, to speak when their services were required, and always to vote. His judgment on the debate was uniformly definite and unhesitating, and his praise and censure were awarded on strictly moral grounds, without any pretence of intellectual discrimination. Those who supported the Government were good, and those who opposed it were wicked; nor was there any neutral class between the sheep and the goats. In some instances his expressions of disapprobation are ludicrously disproportionate to the apparent offence. In 1773, when the affairs of the East India Company were before Parliament, the King returns certain papers to Lord North with the remark that they "show the Duke of

Richmond's blackness, if it wanted any elucidation; and that his whole conduct is dictated by malevolence, not a desire of preventing the Company from any evils he might pretend to foresee." The Duke of Richmond's blackness consisted in his moving for a Conference with the House of Commons on the India Bill; and the King only means to imply that a certain delay may perhaps ensue before the Government measure is passed. It is remarkable that at this period of his reign George III. was extremely hostile to the East India Company, and that he constantly denounces their mode of government, and suggests the transfer of some of their powers to the Crown and to Parliament. Several of the letters relate to the appointment of General Clavering, Mr. Francis, and Colonel Monson to the Indian Council; and it was the King's desire that they should exercise the control which they afterwards attempted to acquire over the policy and administration of Warren Hastings. If Francis had known that the King would describe him as "allowed to be a man of talents," it is possible that some passages in "Junius" might have been less bitter, and the phrase proves conclusively that in 1773 the authorship of Francis was unsuspected. The King assures Lord North that the reception of Francis at the levée, after his return from India, will be influenced by certain information furnished by the Minister. It does not appear whether Francis was to be treated courteously or coldly; but if the King had associated his name with the Letters of Junius, there could have been no question as to the mode of his reception. It was only when Hastings was attacked by Burke and Fox that the King began to appreciate his merits and services. The printers who were charged with breach of privilege, in 1771, for publishing the debates of the House of Commons, fare even worse than the Duke of Richmond. "It is highly necessary," says the King, "that this strange and lawless method of publishing debates in the papers should be put a stop to; but is not the House of Lords, as a Court of Record, the best Court to bring such miscreants before, as it can fine as well as imprison, and as the Lords have broader shoulders to support any odium that this salutary measure may occasion in the minds of the vulgar?" It is interesting to trace the ancient bank of a stream which has long since changed its course. Invidious severity against popular miscreants who have ventured on an eminently useful innovation would no longer be thrown by preference on the broad shoulders of the House of Lords.

The King was as jealous of the privileges of Parliament as of his own prerogative, and he was perfectly sincere in his frequent professions of devotion to "our matchless Constitution." He had not the smallest desire to save society by the irregular usurpations which are supposed to be the proper function of heaven-born Caesars and Napoleons. He says in one of his letters that, while he will not renounce the prerogative of a veto, he hopes that the Crown will always be strong enough to throw out, in one of the two Houses, any measure of which it may disapprove. A king who both reigned and governed, acting in all important matters with the consent of a docile Parliament, seemed to George III. an ideally perfect and historically legitimate ruler. If he had been inclined to philosophical reflection he would perhaps have considered that a House of Commons which uniformly supported the Crown was rather ornamental than useful; but, on the other hand, he might have argued that the responsible Government which he disliked also involved a considerable element of fiction. The Commons and the Crown can only act harmoniously by an abdication of substantial power on one side or the other. The risk of collision has ceased in modern times because the Ministers are a Committee of the majority in the House of Commons. While the experiment was still in progress, George III. not unnaturally attempted the opposite solution of the problem. He had never strained his imagination to conceive the inconveniences which his theory might have produced if the reigning sovereign had been as dissolute and unprincipled as his own younger brothers or as his eldest son. Like many persons of active temperament, he believed that a passion for work implied aptitude for business. The theory of the Constitution, which was to some extent realized during Lord North's Administration, partially explains the exaggerated terms in which Fox, during the remainder of his life, described the absolute power of the Crown. A more dispassionate observer would have discovered that Pitt's authority was derived far more from his ascendancy over the House of Commons than from his favour at Court. Even in the days of Lord North the King was constantly forced to yield to the demands of peers and commoners who possessed Parliamentary influence. In the latter part of his reign he was for the most part content to leave the conduct of affairs to his Minister. His obstinacy in resisting the Catholic claims was exceptional, and it caused a change of Administration.

In administering a Government which had patronage for its main-spring, George III. had constant occasion to consider applications for office, for pensions, and for peerages. Although he neither felt nor affected any scruple at rewarding Parliamentary services in the usual manner, he habitually exercised a check on the lavish prodigality of his Ministers, and on the greediness of suitors for promotion. As pensions were generally charged on his Civil List, he scrutinized applications in the spirit of a paymaster, and he was laudably unwilling to vulgarize the peerage by too numerous creations. In one of several bursts of irritation against Lord Harcourt, who has generally been thought to have been a favourite, the King denounces his presumption in offering, as Lord-Lieutenant, an Irish marquise to Lord Drogheda:—

"I am heartily sick of Lord Harcourt's mode of trying step by step to draw me to fulfil his absurd requests. I desire I may hear no more of Irish Marquises; I feel for the English Earls, and do not choose to disgust them." It is still more to the King's credit that he was perhaps, with the exception of Lord Chatham, the only man in his dominions who regarded personal merit and fitness as qualifications for office. He repeatedly insists, in his letters, on the propriety of appointing competent and learned men to vacant University professorships; and he more than once speaks of piety and purity of life as considerations to be regarded in the appointment of bishops. He constantly refuses his assent to military jobs, on the ground of the injustice which might be inflicted on deserving officers. His grandfather used, according to Lord Hervey, to tell Sir Robert Walpole that he might bribe his rascals of the House of Commons in any other manner, but that he should not pay them with commissions in the army. George III. always wished to limit the employment of corruption in the army, and during the American war his jealousy was stimulated by his dislike of Lord George Germaine, who conducted the war as Secretary for the American Department. "It would be an endless repetition," he tells Lord North on the Secretary's resignation, "to state my objection to decorating Lord George Germaine with a peerage; he has not been of use in his department, and nothing but the most meritorious services could have wiped off his former misfortunes." It must have been under strong pressure that the King afterwards consented to the creation of Viscount Sackville.

As Mr. Donne, in his capacity of editor, is entirely exempt from the *furor biographicus*, his opinion that, of all the promoters of the American secession, the King was least in fault, deserves consideration. Passages may be extracted from the letters which show that George III. ultimately comprehended the magnitude of the blunder which had been committed in taxing the colonies; but his individual obstinacy or firmness undoubtedly prolonged the struggle for three or four years after Lord North had discovered the hopelessness of success. He would have been unanimously supported by the nation in sustaining a vigorous war against France and Spain; and if it had been found impossible to make peace with the revolted colonies, there was no use in prosecuting hostilities on the American continent. When the breach with France was imminent in 1778, the King proposed to Lord North to strengthen the forces in Canada, the Floridas, and Nova Scotia, and without loss of time employ them in attacking New Orleans and the French and Spanish West India possessions. Success in those parts would repay us the great expenses incurred; we must at the same time continue destroying the ports and trade of the rebellious colonies, and thus soon bring both contests to a conclusion.

Shortly afterwards the King still more explicitly recognised the expediency of discontinuing the war in America:—

I think it so desirable [he said] to end the war with that country, that I think it may be proper to keep open the channel of intercourse with that perfidious man (Franklin). . . . but I never will consent that in any treaty that may be concluded a single word be mentioned concerning Canada, Nova Scotia, or the Floridas, which are colonies belonging to this country, and the more they are kept unlike the other colonies the better, for it is by them that we are to keep a certain awe over the abandoned colonies where (i.e. in Canada, &c.) good garrisons must be constantly kept.

Although the colonies would not have been forced into submission by blockades or captures, great misfortunes might have been averted if operations on the mainland had been finally abandoned in 1778. The best excuse for the King's perseverance is to be found in the certainty that he represented the general feeling of the country. Long after statesmen and soldiers had understood the necessity of recognising American independence, the people believed in the possibility and the duty of maintaining the unity of the Empire. If George III. had been a President elected by universal suffrage, he would probably have pursued the policy which he thought incumbent on him as an anointed King. If Mr. Lincoln's army had been defeated at Gettysburg, he would perhaps have been condemned by posterity as an American George III. But for the great superiority of Washington to Howe and to Clinton, Fox, Burke, and Rockingham might possibly have become the "Copperheads" of English history. The analogy between the earlier and later secession would have been still more complete if England and France had followed the example of the Bourbon dynasties in taking the opportunity of civil war to assail a troublesome rival. It is satisfactory to know that the Most Christian King and the Catholic King, whom Mr. Donne twice misnames "Most Catholic," derived no ultimate benefit from the interference which secured the independence of their allies.

SIR CHARLES WOOD'S ADMINISTRATION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.*

IT is difficult to describe this book correctly. If events were narrated somewhat more in detail, and the arguments of Sir Charles Wood's opponents fairly stated and fairly met, we might accept the title-page as an accurate description of the work. A little more warmth of partisanship would have made it a good party pamphlet. As it is, it occupies a neutral position. It purports to chronicle seven eventful years of Indian history; but no writer could, with due regard for accuracy, compress such a record into two hundred large-type octavo pages. The book might more correctly be called a catalogue of the official acts of Sir Charles Wood, with commendatory notes.

* Sir Charles Wood's Administration of Indian Affairs, from 1859 to 1866. By Algernon West. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1867.

Mr. West is the knight-errant of the India Office. Provided Sir Charles Wood's case is duly stated, his *devoir* is performed. It is no part of his intention to give unnecessary prominence to the utterances of rash men who have dared to attack the conduct of his chief. We at first inclined to the belief that we had before us Lord Halifax's own account of the Indian administration over which he presided. Mr. West, in his preface, expresses, in an unusually pointed manner, his obligations to colleagues in the India Office for assistance rendered in the composition of his work; he was Private Secretary to Lord Halifax during the whole period of that Minister's Indian administration, and is the relative as well as the confidential friend of his chief. Lord Halifax, too, was known to entertain the belief that his policy had been unappreciated, and in some instances entirely misunderstood, by the public. The belief, however, that Mr. West's pages contain Lord Halifax's own manifesto is contradicted by internal evidence. The style is not his; the rushing multitude of words, so well remembered by those who were in the habit of listening to Sir Charles Wood in the House of Commons, is absent here. Sir Charles was accustomed to pour forth his speeches with a volubility which gave some countenance to the joke of a rival, that heaven had denied to him the gift of articulate utterance; and that exuberant fluency could scarcely have been trimmed down and restrained within the limits of the somewhat frigid phrases to which Mr. West has rigidly confined himself. We miss, too, the strongly-marked contrasts, so characteristic of Lord Halifax's mind, which result from the deference that he habitually pays to opponents on all points which appear to him still open for discussion, and the haughty self-reliance, almost amounting to arrogance, with which he insists on his opinion when once he has made up his mind.

Mr. West withstands altogether the temptation to argue which would have been irresistible to Lord Halifax. We get no hint that many portions of the narrative, which appear to set forth bare matters of fact, are in reality *ex parte* statements of questions that are still matters of keen debate. Lord Halifax would state his opponent's case, and then proceed gleefully to demolish it, if he could, with keen and sarcastic reasoning. Mr. West makes out the best case he can for his own side, and leaves argument alone. This habit of mind, unusual in an avowed partisan, is adhered to even when it tells against his own case. No allusion whatever is made to the controversy which raged with such fervour between Sir Charles Wood and Mr. Laing when the latter was at the head of Indian finance. In his anxiety to avoid the hot waters of controversy, Mr. West has left the reader to believe what he pleases on the merits of that important quarrel, when in good truth he had an unanswerable case made to his hand in a blue-book which he must know by heart. Mr. West writes in a most enviable frame of mind. His appreciation of any one who is even distantly connected with the India Office is complete. Everything is for the best in this best of all possible offices. Every official receives his meed of praise. The mention made by Mr. West of Lord Canning, Sir James Outram, Lord Clyde, and Lord Elphinstone, men whose lives were sacrificed to hard work in their country's cause under a distant sky, cannot be considered otherwise than as graceful, and well fitting the occasion. But there can surely be no reason for mentioning with equal warmth Mr. Baring, Lord De Grey, Lord Wodehouse, and Lord Dufferin, who succeeded each other, with somewhat bewildering rapidity, as Under-Secretaries between 1861 and 1864. Mr. West himself declares that "scarcely were they enabled to master the rudiments of Indian Government when their services were transferred to some other department." Some, no doubt, of the gentlemen named, deserve all that can be said in their honour; of others we are unable to speak with confidence, their fame not having as yet penetrated beyond Victoria Street.

The work that Lord Halifax had to perform was, beyond question, one of great difficulty and importance. He had, as Mr. West says,

to reconstruct the [Indian] Government at home; and to place not only the Government of India, but every branch of its administration, upon such a footing as the experience of recent years and the requirements of modern times rendered necessary. The councils of the Governor-General and of the minor Presidencies, the courts of judicature, the civil service, the army, the navy, and the police, the codification and administration of the law, the system of land revenue, the finance, and the currency were all to be dealt with.

An undertaking so vast demanded no ordinary qualities. One who had the courage to face the task is entitled to lenient construction of his conduct if, under the pressure of business which he had to dispose of, his judgment and his temper sometimes gave way.

Sir Charles Wood began his apprenticeship to Indian affairs at the Board of Control, over which he presided from 1852 to 1854. It was not till 1859, on the formation of Lord Palmerston's Government, that he returned to the India Office as Secretary of State. In the four years that elapsed between his occupancy of these two offices, great changes were effected. The East India Company, which had held sway in India for a hundred years, was swept away, and its authority transferred to the Crown. Instead of a President of the Board of Control sitting in Cannon Row, and the Board of Directors of the East India Company in Leadenhall Street, there was now a Secretary of State with a Council. The Secretary of State was armed with great powers, and invested with complete responsibility; but practically the working of the department in an entirely new form, officered partly by men newly arrived from India, and unacquainted with English official life, partly by ex-Directors from Leadenhall Street, was inharmonious and crude. The members of Council who had acquired experience

as Directors of the old Company were naturally attached to the system under which they had been accustomed to work. In Leadenhall Street the initiation of despatches on all subjects rested with the heads of departments, by whom they were submitted to the President of the Board of Control. Lord Stanley, who was Secretary of State under Lord Derby's Government when the Indian Government Act came into force in 1858, permitted a similar course to be adopted in the India Office. Sir Charles Wood found the Council divided into three Committees; the Secretary of each Committee prepared the despatches of his department, and these documents only reached the eye of the Secretary of State when they had been agreed to by the Committee in which they originated. A large part of the Council were thus committed to a particular course before the Secretary of State was consulted. It is obvious that a Minister can only direct the policy of his department by taking into his own hands the initiative of all business; and Sir Charles Wood's first reform was in that direction. It was no slight triumph to work harmoniously with a Council composed of able and independent men whom he had deprived of all real power, while he was entirely dependent upon them for the technical knowledge which could alone prevent him from becoming a cypher in his own office. Men like Sir John Lawrence and Sir George Clerk, who formed part of the Indian Council, can hardly be suspected of subserviency to any Minister, nor is it likely that they would submit to any influence other than that of tact and temper. Mr. West is therefore, we think, justified in his assumption that "it is a convincing testimony to the skill and tact with which he availed himself of the abilities and experience of the members of his Council . . . that during his whole tenure of office Sir Charles Wood overruled them only four times."

While the machinery of government at home was thus in process of reconstruction, that machinery was itself called upon to work strong and even violent changes in India. The first in point of time was the Act passed in 1861 for the constitution of the Council of the Governor-General and the local government of the minor Presidencies. Previous to that date, the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay were unable to make laws, even on the most trivial subject, except with the consent, and on the initiative, of the Governor-General in Council. As the European communities year by year grew in numbers and importance they became desirous of obtaining a share in the government of their own affairs. They talked of a Calcutta Parliament, and strongly urged the introduction into India of the colonial system of self-government. But the public opinion of India is the opinion of a small European community whose interests are mainly commercial; their ideas of policy and law are liable to the bias which commercial pursuits are likely to produce. To entrust the governing power to such a body would be to repeat, with open eyes, the mistake which ruined the Spanish colonies of America under precisely similar circumstances. It was Lord Canning's opinion that the more intelligent natives might with propriety be called upon to take their share in public affairs. A Bill was therefore passed which instructed the Governor-General to summon to his Council not less than six additional members, who might be either Europeans or natives. The first Council which assembled after the passing of this Act contained three native gentlemen and two Europeans unconnected with the Civil Service. This useful reform was adopted at the instance, and carried out under the eye, of Lord Canning. We do not, however, quarrel with Mr. West for claiming the merit of it for Sir Charles Wood. Chambers of a somewhat similar nature were established in Madras and Bombay. In the latter Presidency, Sir George Clerk selected no less than four natives for the honour of a seat at the Council. Simultaneously with these reforms, a great change was made in the administration of the law. The Supreme and Sudder Courts were amalgamated; and Englishmen accused of crime—who, as Mr. West informs us, could be tried nowhere but in Calcutta (we suppose he means nowhere but in their Presidency town)—were brought under the cognizance of Courts nearer the place where their alleged crime was committed.

Mr. West next turns to the question of indigo contracts, which, he says, convulsed society in Bengal to its centre soon after the accession of Sir Charles Wood to office. We admit that Sir Charles did substantial justice in this matter, and that his decision was, in the main, in consonance with English law and feeling. But there is no doubt that the planters suffered grievously in consequence of the conclusion which was arrived at, and that, to use Mr. West's own words, "the Bengal indigo system" on which many European planters had staked their whole capital "came virtually to an end." We do not complain of Sir Charles Wood's decision, but we wish Mr. West had told us something of the views put forward by his opponents. From Mr. West's account one would imagine that the planters had no arguments to adduce, that public feeling both here and in India was made up on the subject from the very first, and that a few obstinate planters alone adopted a view adverse to that of Sir Charles Wood. Mr. West tells us, that a Commission on the subject was appointed by Lord Canning, "consisting of six members, two of them belonging to the Civil Service, one being a missionary, two native gentlemen, and the sixth Mr. Fergusson a planter." He quotes from the Report of that Commission to prove that the cultivation of indigo was not a free cultivation on the part of the ryots. Upon this point the whole question turned. Though Mr. West does not expressly and in terms declare that the Report was unanimous, yet when he first enumerates the persons composing the Commission, and then refers to their Report to prove his case, he

almost compels the inference that it was unanimous. But if Mr. West will turn to the Memorial of the Landowners and Commercial Association of British India to the Secretary of State*, he will find on page 6 a memorandum respecting this Report, of which the following are the opening sentences:—

The Report which the Lieutenant-Governor in his Minute assumes to be the Report of the Commission was drawn up by Mr. Seton Karr, Secretary to the Lieutenant-Governor.

It was assented to only by the Rev. Mr. Sale, and Baboo C. M. Chatterjee. It was in all its important parts dissented from by Mr. Temple, the Secretary to the Indian Finance Minister, and now the energetic member of the Finance Commission of India.

It was protested against, *in toto*, by Mr. Fergusson, for the reason that "The language and tone tend to give a colouring, and to lead to conclusions not proved from the facts."

However much Sir Charles Wood was justified in the conclusion that he arrived at—and it is undeniable that public policy was opposed to making breaches of civil contract punishable by the criminal law—Mr. West gives an inaccurate idea of the case of his opponents.

We will not disturb the dust which now reposes peacefully on the great finance blue-book, once such a *terrifica causa* of war between Sir Charles Wood and Mr. Laing. Mr. West, with extreme discretion, declines the combat, and dismisses the whole question with a curt intimation that "the Government of India at that time looked upon Sir Charles Wood's financial statement as too sanguine." We shudder to think of the throes which must have agitated the haughty soul of Lord Halifax when he perused the proof-sheets of his biographer. What an opportunity was here allowed to escape, for loud and complacent jubilation! Self-restraint must have been the more meritorious and the more difficult when we remember that it was in Sir Charles Wood's power to show that a financier who had impugned his policy and "considered his financial statement too sanguine," had backed that opinion by figures in which he had made mistakes to the amount of more than 1,000,000*l.* Everybody remembers how Sir Charles Wood chuckled, and Mr. Laing writhed under the exposure of that unlucky but quite undeniable blunder. An effort such as that which restrained Mr. West's pen, in the middle of an "apologia," from fighting the great victory over once more, is nothing less than heroic.

The sale of waste lands in India was one of the subjects most keenly debated in the House of Commons during the years 1862 and 1863. A large portion of the income of India is derived immediately from the land. Salt and opium, customs and stamps, put together, do not yield so large a return as that obtained under the single head of Land. Before the Mutiny, as we are told by Mr. West, more than half the revenues of India were derived from that source; and in the year 1865-66 it was estimated at more than twenty millions, in a total income of forty-seven millions. Lord Canning in October, 1861, proposed, on behalf of the Government of India, that all unoccupied waste land should be sold, at a uniform price of 2½ rupees per acre for such lands as were encumbered by jungle, and ten rupees for such as were cleared. A clause in the Governor-General's proposal provided, that an intending purchaser should declare his intention to buy, thirty days before the sale. During that time, any one having a claim upon the land might assert it. But at the end of the thirty days, if no claimant appeared, the purchaser acquired an indefeasible title. It was supposed that the energetic capitalists were only waiting for opportunities such as that here presented to them, to flock to the jungles, "and convert a howling wilderness into a smiling cotton-field." Lord Canning himself expressed his belief that "harmony of interests between permanent European settlers and the half-civilized tribes by whom most of the waste districts and the country adjoining them are thinly peopled, will conduce to the material and moral improvement of large classes of the Queen's Indian subjects, which for any such purposes have long been felt by the Government to be almost out of the reach of ordinary agencies." We think that Sir Charles Wood was right in lending very slight credence to these anticipations. Jungle there was in abundance; but it by no means followed that, because it was unimproved, it was therefore without an owner. Nearly all lands belonged to some proprietor. Sometimes it was the neighbouring zemindar, sometimes the inhabitants of an adjacent village, who obtained from them pasture for their cattle. To sell such lands for the purposes of the Government would be a direct act of confiscation, and the limit of thirty days, during which any claimant was to lodge his petition, was evidently far too short for the purpose of affording him adequate protection. The really waste lands were usually situated in remote districts, among predatory and warlike tribes. It was not very likely that Europeans would be inclined to settle among them; so that, if any sales were effected, they would occur in districts already subject to rights in many instances complicated and difficult to decide.

It was also clear that lands enjoying every advantage of soil, climate, and situation, placed perhaps close to a navigable river, or in the vicinity of a railroad station, should not be considered as of the same value as a tract of sandy desert far removed from cultivation, or even from communication with other districts. Sir Charles Wood therefore determined that the action of the proposed resolution should be confined to certain specified tracts in Assam, Oude, and the Central provinces; that in every case a survey should precede the sale; and that, instead of a fixed price, every

* East India; Indigo Contracts, House of Commons, May 28, 1861.

lot should be put up to public auction. This course has been justified by the result, for we are told by Mr. West that as much as 8l. per acre has been realized by the Government for lands which, under the resolution, would have been sold for 5s. Another branch of the same question was the redemption of the Land-tax authorized by Lord Canning. The Viceroy's views found supporters in the council of Sir Charles Wood, the principal reason alleged being that of Mr. Macnaughten, who declared that the redemption was of great political importance:—

The fortunes of the zemindar, he said, who has been allowed to extinguish his fixed annual liabilities by a single payment, are from thenceforth still more intimately connected than they are at present with those of the British Government. The immunity from taxation which he is enabled under our rule to claim, and which no native conqueror could be expected to recognise, renders his loyalty a matter of prudence and self-interest. He is attached to the cause of order by a tie similar to, and not less strong than, that which binds the fundholder of a European State. This is no slight advantage, and may fairly be held to counterbalance some inconveniences of detail, which may arise in effecting an arrangement such as is here suggested.

Sir Charles Wood, however, objected to the resolution of Lord Canning. There was no source of income so little unpopular as the land revenue; and he disliked the sacrifice of so safe and secure an income. He therefore overruled that portion of Lord Canning's scheme; but he agreed to another portion of the same proposal which authorized a direct permanent settlement of the land revenue. A revision of the existing assessment was a necessary preliminary to any permanent arrangement; and Sir Charles Wood directed that "a full, fair, and equable rent should be imposed on all lands under temporary settlement." He was prepared, on the basis thus obtained, to sanction a permanent settlement of the land revenue throughout India. This measure operated in one way unfavourably to the Government, inasmuch as it would no longer be able from time to time to increase its revenue by the imposition of a larger tax. Sir Charles Wood, however, held, we think rightly, that Government could not fail to participate in any advantages accruing to the people, and that the people would acquire more ability to bear increased taxation in other shapes.

The introduction and extensive cultivation of the chincona tree, which took place under the direction and with the approval of Sir Charles Wood, is a benefit to science and humanity which should not be passed without a word of approval, and may be fitly noted here.

(To be continued.)

THE CLERGY AND THE PULPIT.*

THE clergy of the Church of England have had the defects in their sermons pretty freely pointed out of recent years, and a variety of remedies for their failings have been suggested in various quarters. The publication of the work before us seems to have been prompted by a desire to see whether, home resources having failed, anything can be done for them by foreign precept and example. It is a translation by Mr. Badger of a portion of a work by the Abbé Mullois, which appears to have obtained a very wide circulation in France, twenty thousand copies of it, we are told, having been already sold in that country. The translator seems to hope that, in spite of its author having originally intended it solely for his own countrymen, it will be found, in its English dress, equally serviceable to the clergy here.

Of the translation we have not much to say, not having the original version before us. It seems to be rendered with tolerable fluency and vigour. The principal complaint perhaps that could be made is that Mr. Badger, in the attempt to be idiomatic, has sometimes adopted English slang terms, which strike one as rather out of place in a translation, especially when they occur in juxtaposition with exclusively French ideas. He speaks, for instance, of a crowd composed of "blacklegs and setters-up of barricades"; whilst on another occasion an artisan, in a conversation of a decidedly French character with the priest who had converted him, informs the preacher of the way in which he had "bagged him."

With respect to the work itself, we shall express our opinion presently as to how far it is likely to be of much service in the way which the author and the translator have in view. It seems to be the production of a candid, kindly, and religious man, very anxious at the same time to let it be seen that he is a Frenchman and a man of the world. The last two characteristics are certainly very prominent. We are told, for instance, that "when Providence designs to spread an idea throughout the world, it implants it in a Frenchman's breast. There it is quickly elaborated; and then that breast, so magnanimous and communicative, so fascinating and attractive, gives it currency with electric speed." This tone of national vanity, to which a rhetorical writer is peculiarly prone, pervades the whole book. The style of condemnation which he sometimes adopts in speaking of sins, a style which he recommends to other preachers, sounds odd to an English ear, and more what one would expect of Lord Chesterfield than of a modern ecclesiastic. He says, for instance, "A man curses and swears in your presence. Don't tell him that it is a sin. . . . Tell him rather that it is unseemly, that

it is vulgar, that it shows bad taste." In another place he recommends a preacher, under certain circumstances, to establish, as the first point, "that there is no disgrace attached to the practice of religion." One cause of this deference to public opinion may be an uneasy consciousness that the clergy are objects, not merely of distrust, but of positive hatred, to a large portion of the French people. We may detect in some parts of the book something almost amounting to a plea for common courtesy, like that of a priest doffing his hat as he gets into a railway carriage or diligence. Much of the Abbé's advice to the young ecclesiastics, in fact, reads almost like that of the commander of an army of occupation suggesting to his officers how they may escape giving unnecessary offence to a hostile people. We are told of the priest being greeted with scowling looks and morose replies when he enters a workshop, and of a labourer who declares the pleasure it would give him to break a priest's neck. The following advice also would hardly be thought necessary in the case of an English curate:—

You are a priest, and in walking along hear some one imitate the cry of a raven. Such an occurrence is less frequent now, but it happens occasionally. You recognise a human voice, for you hear the accompanying remark:—"It will be foul weather to-day, and some misfortune will befall us, for the ravens are on the wing." Take no notice of the ill-nature, and do not assume a proud or disdainful demeanour. It is vulgar to do so, and by no means Christian.

There is, however, much shrewdness and common sense in many of the Abbé's remarks. On the subject of the best length for sermons, a topic to which he devotes a chapter, he gives advice which some in England would be glad to see adopted by our own clergy. On the whole, he seems to think that seven minutes is about the right time, though some holy men and great preachers have been fully satisfied with five. So great will be the effect of sermons of that length that the Abbé feels sure that, when an irreligious man falls sick, his cry will be, Send me the man who preaches the seven minutes' sermon. The following account of the process by which the Jesuit novice is taught to read and preach may be interesting to some persons:—

A novice among the Jesuits, no matter what he may have been previously—whether a lawyer, author, preacher, canon, grand vicar, bishop, or even a cardinal—must attend to a reading-class three or four times a week. There he is made to read like a child, is taught to articulate and accentuate, and every now and then is stopped, while those present are called upon to point out the merits and defects in his reading. This training is persisted in until his pronunciation is perfect, and he is free from all disagreeable accent.

But that is not all. Every Monday during his novitiate, or during the term of his studies, that is, for five, six, eight, or ten years, he has to undergo a training in the *tones*, which consists in his being made to recite what is called the *formula of the general tones*—a short discourse, comprising all the tones ordinarily used in oratorical compositions; such as the tone of persuasion, of menace, of kindness, of anger, of the mercy and justice of God, of prayer, and of authority. Thereby the young preacher is taught how to supply, to break in his own organism, and to adapt it to those different tones.

After these come the *special tones*. This consists of a short discourse, to be composed in two hours on a given text, and must contain certain specified strokes of oratory. Three or four of the younger novices are exercised in this way, exclusive of the sermons which are preached in the refectory.

With regard to the general value of the Abbé's book, at least for English readers, we do not think highly. Its tone is pleasing, and in parts it is interesting; but it is written too entirely from a French point of view, and for the French priesthood, to be of much real use to the English clergy. For this latter purpose it cannot for a moment be compared with some of our common English manuals upon the same subject—with the late Professor Blunt's *Lectures on the duties of a parish priest*, for example. The title which is given to it, "The Clergy and the Pulpit," is rather misleading; we should be inclined to substitute for this, "Hints on Conduct and Behaviour for the French Priesthood." This would give the reader a better notion beforehand of the real subject-matter of the book. The translator quotes in his preface some remarks by the Abbé Mullois upon the common complaints about the dullness of sermons, which will surprise some of those who appear to think dullness the exclusive right of the Anglican clergy. He says that the people complain in France, just as they do here, that sermons weary them dreadfully, that the phraseology used is humdrum and threadbare, and that their monotonous uniformity is enough to send into a doze even those who have lost the habit of sleeping. Mr. Badger seems to think that the Abbé's advice may help to cure this evil; we think that, in addition to the remedy being inherently unsuited to English constitutions, the disease itself is one quite beyond the power of human cure.

For why are sermons dull? The main reason, we take it, is that given in a rather coarse form in the common proverb, that you can't make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. A large portion of the clergy cannot be otherwise than dull when they preach, simply because it is not in them. Their speeches are dull, their letters are dull, their conversation is dull, except when you want actual information from them which they happen to possess. We are not speaking in contempt in saying this. We merely mean that, with the sources of intellectual excitement so abundant as they now are on every side, the merely average man can hardly expect to speak continuously upon any subject in a way to interest an intelligent listener. Let any one who has been at college try to recall to his mind the average capacity of those of his companions who have taken orders, and then remember that these same men represent for the most part that educated portion of the clergy whose gradual supersession by the literates is becoming a subject of such constant complaint, and we think he will hardly wonder at the average sermon not being a very thrilling perform-

* *The Clergy and the Pulpit in their Relations to the People.* By M. l'Abbé Isidore Mullois, Chaplain to the Emperor Napoleon III., and Missionary Apostolic. Translated by George Percy Badger, late Chaplain in the Diocese of Bombay, Author of "The Nestorians and their Rituals," &c. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1867.

ance. College stories abound about the desperate shifts to which unhappy curates and country rectors are sometimes driven by the exigencies of the pulpit. One of these men has been known, in his despair, to seek sympathy and counsel of a friend. He said that he had given his congregation Newman's sermons, and Maurice's sermons, and Spurgeon's sermons; were there any other published ones his friend could recommend when those were exhausted? Men being what they are, it seems to us that the modern demand for two sermons a week from almost every clergyman cannot be expected to produce anything but dulness. Edification of course may be obtained, either directly or in the indirect mode suggested by George Herbert; but interest ought hardly to be looked for, even though the preacher were a master of all the "general" and "special" tones of the Jesuit body. If people will insist upon having a constant succession of sermons, sermons of course will be procured; but it does not follow that they must come direct from the preacher's brain. Some buy their sermons, others borrow them, others get them sent round on the plan of the circulating libraries; whilst those who have the advantage of living near a great library rush to its shelves on the days when it opens, and take out the volumes which they think will suit the taste of their flock. Hence those mysterious pencil marks, directing the preacher what to read and what to omit, which one may sometimes see on the pages of volumes of printed sermons, and which are such a puzzle to the unsuspecting lay reader. Those whose conscience will not allow them to resort to these contrivances are driven to compose for themselves. But this is a thing which nature never meant them to do, and the dulness which is complained of seems an indication that we are transgressing one of nature's laws. A defect of natural power is quite incurable by any books, whether little or big books. Works such as that before us may be very interesting, and may be the means of conveying useful hints to here and there an individual, but we fear that they will necessarily be quite powerless to produce any effect upon the character of sermons in the mass.

MR LOWE'S SPEECHES AND LETTERS.*

MR. LOWE'S volume of *Speeches and Letters on Reform* has a double value. In the first place, it is a collection of what Mr. Lowe has said about Reform, and deserves to stand by the side of the other republications of the season on the great subject of the day. In the second place, Mr. Lowe has written a preface. The irony of Fortune has inflicted upon him the same doom which fell upon Mr. Gladstone after his first outburst of enthusiasm two years ago. The necessity of composing a preface afterwards is a fit penalty for saying a little too much in the ardour of debate. The rival indiscretions of the champion and the assailant of Reform will thus go down to posterity, together with glosses composed by themselves in the solitude of their own studies. Mr. Lowe's preface is peculiarly interesting at the moment, on account of a single passage which seems to indicate that deep within the recesses of his own brain lurk the seeds of a possible Reform Bill. Saul also, it seems, may hereafter be found, like Lord Russell and Mr. Disraeli, among the prophets. In one of the most remarkable speeches of last Session, Mr. Lowe pleaded for delay. The fates granted this part of his prayer. The Session closed with an adjournment of the question of Reform; and after a vacation of popular agitation he reappears, having made some use at all events of the interval, with a suggestion that, if Reform is inevitable, he thinks he sees his way to a species of compromise:—

The problem then is, if we must have Reform, to find some franchise which shall take in those above 101, as well as those below, and which instead of leading on by inevitable consequence to household suffrage, contains within itself a principle of limitation which may enable it by its own automatic force to resist the downward pressure which lurks in the very nature of a money qualification for a vote. *I believe the problem by no means insoluble.*

This oracular intimation is not accompanied by any hint as to the nature of the solution in question. It is disappointing that Mr. Lowe should not have dwelt further on the point.

Never probably in the history of the debates of this century has there been a more brilliant series of rhetorical efforts than that contained in the small book before us. For two successive Sessions Mr. Lowe has contended against all electoral change with the consummate power of an intellectual gladiator. His argument has been lucid, vehement, consistent. His position cannot for a moment be misunderstood, though, in our opinion, it is one which would lead to all sorts of dangerous consequences. It is a pleasure to have to deal with a controversialist so fearless, and so clear; who does not think obscurely, or wrap up in a cloud of ambiguous words the premises from which he starts. As a whole, Mr. Lowe's speeches on Reform are finer mental productions than any others on the same topic; and it is well worth while to analyse his political system, and to point out why it cannot be accepted as a sound one.

The fundamental axiom with which he starts is that politics must be treated experimentally. You cannot argue about them *a priori*. Comte tells us that there are three phases through which the human mind passes—the theological, the metaphysical, and the inductive or scientific. Mr. Lowe refuses to consider politics except from the last point of view. He will not hear of abstract rights. The divine right of peoples is as idle and visionary a thing as the divine right of kings; and he goes

so far as to call Mr. Mill's treatment of Reform "metaphysical"—the first time, possibly, that Mr. Mill has been accused of such a fault. The argument that the working-classes are to be enfranchised because they have "rights," because they are our "fellow-Christians," or because, to use Mr. Gladstone's celebrated expression, they are "our own flesh and blood," Mr. Lowe puts altogether aside. All this sort of talk he deems idle and illogical, as resting upon an assumption that there are, or can be, rights antecedent to and independent of society and law, whereas rights depend on society and law for their very existence. The onus is therefore on those who wish to change. Let the innovators show him that their improvements tend to some appreciable good, and he will listen to them. The end of politics is good government, and Reform is inadmissible except when it has been shown that it will result in a better sort of government than that under which our fathers have been content to live and flourish. This is Mr. Lowe's first standing-point, and it is the key to his whole line of defences.

The first observation that occurs to one is that Mr. Lowe is kind enough to attribute to educated Liberals a number of opinions which they do not hold. Like the orthodox country parson, he first builds up his imaginary Infidel from the depths of his moral consciousness, after which it is a very easy matter to knock him down. In reality, educated people are quite as little disposed to take a metaphysical view of politics as himself. Mr. Lowe enters indeed upon the stage with a flourish of trumpets, and professes himself the only true inductive philosopher; but as a fact, most sensible men in politics admit the premises from which Mr. Lowe sets out. To borrow an old philosophic epigram, there is nothing in Lowe which there was not in Bentham already, and it does not require a heaven-sent logician to convince the world that political metaphysics are out of date. Of course they are. In common with the rest of his fellow-creatures who have thought about such matters, Mr. Lowe has come to a sound and safe principle as a beginning; but it is not a discovery of his. Mr. Mill, whom he represents to the House of Commons as a metaphysician, came to it long ago. But it does not therefore follow, as Mr. Lowe goes on to argue, that it is absurd, in political matters, to talk of "rights." No doubt the term is capable of abuse. Abstract rights are a dream and a chimaera, just as an abstract horse or an abstract railway carriage is mere nonsense. There may, however, be relative rights. Mr. Lowe would admit so much, but he would urge perhaps that a man's relative rights are nothing but what the law gives him. A working-man may, upon this hypothesis, have a right, under and in virtue of the law, to hold what he has got, but he has a right to nothing more. This would be anything but an exhaustive account of the subject of "rights." There are a large class of so-called "rights" which, upon this view, would be altogether unmeaning, which nevertheless have a meaning, and are recognised universally in every civilized country. Human beings are not to be judged only with reference to the national circle to which they happen immediately to belong. They are part of a wider social body still—members of that ill-defined social organization which, for want of a better name, we call civilization. Their rights in virtue of such membership are not abstract, but depend entirely on laws (discoverable by induction) which lay down what is for the good of mankind in general and what is not. These wider laws conflict very often with the narrower laws which the smaller social body that constitutes the nation has enacted for itself. Wherever this is the case, politicians have just reason to complain of the narrower municipal law as being incompatible with the general advantage of the race. If Mr. Lowe's theory is consistently adopted, the law of the land, as established, becomes the supreme standard of right or wrong. No theory could be more monstrous. If so, slavery, so long as it was constitutional, could not be impeached, except on some fine selfish calculation that it was for the benefit of the individual State to abolish it. In reality, the right of human beings to be free is a right independent of municipal law. It may not be an abstract right. But it is a relative and positive right, derived from the maxim that, on the whole, slavery is opposed to the happiness of the world at large. If municipal law does not recognise the maxim, municipal law must be altered, and until it is altered the slave, using language in a rough and popular way, may fairly say that, all laws and Acts of Parliament notwithstanding, he has a right to be free. If this expression about his "rights" is analysed, it merely amounts to the assertion that the world cannot advance upon the principles adopted by the country in which he lives, and that the country which limits his personal liberty by its exceptional legislation is violating a higher positive law, which is to be arrived at by considering the interests of humanity at large. If it is for the advantage of mankind that men should govern themselves, instead of being governed, the most practical and positive of philosophers need not hesitate to adopt a word sanctioned by common parlance, and to say that men have a "right" to be free and self-governed. Mr. Lowe's theory, if consistent with itself, would put an end to the idea of freedom.

And if this is so, it is a very inadequate expression to say that good government is the end and *summum bonum* of politics, if by good government is to be meant—what Mr. Lowe means—the perfection of the national Executive. The object of politics surely is not to turn out a good law-making machine. If so, a beneficent paternal despotism is all that can be desired; and that nation is happiest which has wise legislative enactments served out to it by provident autocrats. If it is at all true to say that good government is the end of politics, it is only

* *Speeches and Letters on Reform; with a Preface by the Right Hon. R. Lowe, M.P.* London: Robert J. Bush. 1867.

true when a totally different sense is given to the term from that which is essential to Mr. Lowe's argument. A great orator once said that it was better for a country to have bad laws, if it stood by them, than to have good laws and to be perpetually altering them. In like manner, it may be conceived that a nation in the long run will fare the best which begins with self-government and blunders, rather than one which is governed always by an oligarchy of sages. Raw and inexperienced citizens of course commit mistakes. It is better for them to accustom themselves to the political ice, slippery though it be, than to watch the evolutions of a dominant class, however skilful, from a safe distance on the shore.

When once this is conceded, the whole of Mr. Lowe's political system goes by the board. It no longer becomes material to prove, what he denies, that the present House of Commons is a failure. It is quite enough to show that popular representation in the long run is more productive of good to mankind than class government. The object of Reform is less to improve the structure of the House of Commons as a machine, than to make its structure conformable to the growth of the nation. But even with respect to the minor issue, Reformers would scarcely admit that Mr. Lowe grapples adequately with the question whether or not the House of Commons is capable of structural amelioration. The House is a very noble institution as it is. We do not believe that there is any assembly in the world so incapable of committing deliberate injustice, or so capable of making personal sacrifices for the public good. But it is quite possible that a more popular House might discuss many questions in a way which would give more satisfaction to the mass of people for whom it legislates. No better example can be taken than one which is furnished by a sentence of Mr. Lowe's. He ridicules the "rights of labour," and laughs at the idea that a Reformed Parliament would be ready to discuss them. "Are we," he says, "to have the doctrines of Fourier and St. Simon discussed here?" Nobody is likely to suspect this journal of a tendency towards the views of St. Simon. But whatever these views may be, we really do not see why the reasons for them or against them should not be discussed in any English legislative assembly if it were seriously worth while; and if a Reformed House is likely to discuss them more freely and fairly than the present, this would be decidedly an argument in favour of Reform. It is begging the question to say that a Reformed Parliament would be a tumultuous democratic body, and would impose its own economical fallacies on an educated minority. That may be the case in Colonial Legislatures. But England starts with the advantage of a powerful educated class, whose influence will not be destroyed simply because some of the artificial protections and barriers supplied by the franchise, as it now exists, are pulled down. The House of Commons will certainly continue to represent education and property, and its deliberations will not lose in intelligence what they gain in popular strength. We are far even from holding that, in the present state of Europe, the foreign and domestic policy of the nation might not gain a great deal by Reform. For the moment, both at home and abroad, we appear to be paralysed. Classes seem suspicious of one another, and the result is that action on any subject becomes difficult or impossible. Restore the harmony and the natural confidence of all sections of the English nation, and you will restore to it a substantial quantity of life and energy.

This leads us finally to Mr. Lowe's last fallacy. Reform, he tells us, is synonymous with democracy; and democracy is a form of government under which the poor govern the rich. Emancipate the multitude; arm them with the one thing they want to make them formidable—a Parliamentary vote; and, says Mr. Lowe, you make them at once your masters. They will insist on protection at home, and on a spirited and warlike policy abroad. The organization of the working-classes is great already; enfranchise them, and they will become omnipotent. And if they were to be enfranchised after a long and virulent struggle of class against class, this might perhaps be so. But England is not Australia, nor is it America. Rank, property, and education exist already, and will not cease to have their natural influence, because they are ready to abandon a monopoly of political privileges. Reform in its best sense is not democracy. It is free trade applied to politics—not the destruction of rank and intelligence, but a destruction of the unnecessary entrenchments behind which rank and education have fortified themselves. Cast them freely upon the waters, and in England rank and intelligence will swim, and head the stream. Violent and excessive changes are not now in question. It is fair to take all wise precautions which may be thought necessary against democratic license. But when all other nations are moving in the direction of popular Reform, England surely can afford "to trust to freedom of the blood." The Crown never was secure in Great Britain till it based itself on the will of a free people, and education and property will not suffer by resting on the same sure and permanent foundation.

THREE HUNDRED ÆSOP'S FABLES.*

LAST year Messrs. Warne issued from their press a work which scarcely did justice to their wonted discrimination—a new edition of Croxall's *Æsop*, minus Croxall's *Morals*. In the place of these, some slightly tedious reflections or sermonettes were inserted by the editor, the Reverend G. F. Townsend. Croxall's

* *Three Hundred Æsop's Fables*. Literally translated from the Greek. By the Rev. G. Fyler Townsend, M.A. London: G. Routledge & Sons. 1867.

Æsop is at best a wordy, worthless production, and we took some pains at the time to show that Mr. Townsend's tags and tassels, in the form of new morals, did little to improve it. It seems that Mr. Townsend, feeling himself capable of higher things, and roused by the criticism bestowed on his second-hand *Æsop*, has since had recourse to the fountain-head, and he now comes again before the public with an original translation of his own. In an article on "Children's Books" in the current *Quarterly*, deserved ridicule is cast on the sorry figure cut by his last year's *Æsop*, and it is well that Mr. Townsend can now invite a judgment upon his own merits, and can appeal from his last year's self, with Croxall, like the old man of the sea, clinging to his back, to his present self, carrying no heavier weight than lively *Æsop*. For *Æsop*, whether regarded as a person or as the abstraction of a class of men, must needs have been lively, or his name, and the connexion of it with fable, would never have become and remained so popular, such a spell to arrest in all ages the interest of old as well as young. And lively he has always been represented by those who have best succeeded in handing him down since his first reception through oral tradition. Indeed, all the dead weight in the extant editions may be gauged by the measure of servility to monkish prosiness and charlatanism which is to be found in the several editions of the Greek prose fables. Not one of these has any pretence to antiquity. There is not one which careful comparison will not prove to be more or less pillaged from the choliambics of Babrius; and so manifestly vamped up and cobbled are many of the prose versions that, at various periods before the seasonable discovery of the Babrian MSS. in 1844, scholars sniffed the presence of some such personage as Babrius in the background. To pass over the light thrown upon him by Bentley, Tyrwhitt, and others of more recent date, it is curious that in the notes to the very useful edition of prose fables, by F. de Furia, from the stores of the Vatican, that learned Italian not only pointed out the easy resolution of many fables, which he had unearthed, into choliambics; but, in accounting for slight variations in two fables on the same subject in his own collection, he remarked:—"Hæc varietas declarat Æsopicas fabulas a Babrii opere variè a variis in prosam resolutas a librariis avaritiâ in unum concervatas, ut volumina majora conformarent." (F. de Furia, p. 52, notes.) And this will be found to be the true state of the case. The useless lumber of the prose fables is chiefly due to the blundering awkwardness of Planudes, and of the monks who emulated his botching paraphrase of Babrius. This being so, a sound instinct, as we have before pointed out, would dictate the close comparison of the extant fables of Babrius with the better class of prose fables, and the rigid excision by modern translators of all in the latter which has no warranty in, or recommendation beyond, the former. Such we conceive to be the only fair way of representing *Æsop*; whereas in past time he has suffered as much from the bunglers whose forgeries misrepresent his mind as from the sheer fiction-mongers who have invented a humpback for his body. Justice will best be done to Mr. Townsend's present volume by examining how far he has kept in view the canon which we have enunciated, and of which indeed he admits the force when, in his preface, he recants his past errors, and repudiates his old love, the "padded, diluted, and altered" *Æsop* of Croxall.

There can be no doubt that Mr. Townsend has betaken himself to a worthier object of devotion, and has produced a version with far greater claims to be a trustworthy translation, though we own it is often a puzzle to discover which of the various prose collections he has followed, and to get at his authority for divers additions to the accredited features of the prose texts. Thus, in the Fable of "the Pomegranate, the Apple Tree, and the Bramble" (p. 16)—the authorities for which are Halm's *Prose Fables*, 385, F. de Furia, 176, and Babrius 28, p. 2—the prose versions represent the interference of the bramble in the quarrel between the fruit-trees in the simple words, ἀλλ', ὡ φίλοι, πανωμίθε ποτε μαχόμεναι. Here Babrius has πανωμίθε ἔρδον, ὡ φίλοι, πρὶ καλλοῦς; whereas Townsend expands it into "Pray, my dear friends, in my presence at least, cease from such vain disputings." This amplification we take to be foreign to *Æsopian* humour, and indicative, so far as it goes, of little appreciation thereof by the translator. The gist of the whole is the bramble's implied assumption of coequality with its betters. Again, in "The Man and the Lion" (p. 18), Mr. Townsend's version begins—"A man and a lion travelled together through the forest. . . . As they were disputing, they passed a statue," &c. &c. Now, as statues do not commonly ornament forests, one is curious to see what the best authorities have to say to the italicized words. Neither Halm nor De Furia nor Babrius nor Phædrus has aught about a forest, and the insertion of it is plainly *de trop*, for, if existing in any copy of a Greek fable, it is so untrustworthy that there need be no scruple about summarily ejecting it. Again, in p. 25, Mr. Townsend describes "the sick lion" as retiring to his den, lying down there, and pretending to be sick, "taking care that his sickness should be publicly known." There is no foundation for these last words in the better Greek texts. But, as a little illustration of the terse and graphic style of Babrius, we may notice that what Mr. Townsend thus directly conveys, the choliambic poet leaves to be inferred from a graceful and speaking line—

φωνὴν βαρύναν προσποιεῖσθαι λεπτύνων—(f. 103).

For pretence smoothing down his harsh roar.

Any one may see that this would of itself give currency to the rumour. Real genius shows itself in these felt but unseen

touches. And, once more, in the fable of the "Sick Stag" (p. 41), we look in vain through the best prose versions for any trace of the stag making its bed "in a quiet corner of its pasture-ground." What answers to it in Halm is *ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ τοῦ πεδίου*, and in Babrius (Fab. 46) *πάλιν ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ βοσχοῖν*, but neither will account for Mr. Townsend's English. This would be nothing strange did not the translation profess to be literal. It is to be regretted that fable compilers do not make a rule of selecting the most memorable version of each fable out of the many they have for choice. Then all other variations of the "Sick Stag" would give way before that of Babrius, whose version is not only more lively and telling, but also bears curiously on the "corvina" and "cervina senectus," a moot point among scholars, and of some interest to naturalists.

Apart from the question of literality, there is little fault to find in this latest translation of the so-called *Æsop's Fables*. Here and there the beasts may seem too fond of tall talk, though in this respect they "draw it much milder" than in Croxall. We are not so sure that readers who are knowing in fable literature will not still prefer, in this particular, the more natural liveliness of Canon James. The exception taken by Mr. Townsend to that pleasant writer's free translation is that "he has introduced as the point of the fable conventional English sayings which are not sanctioned in the Greek," and that so "his version frequently approaches a paraphrase rather than a translation." Now, if there is one special aim in Mr. James's work, it is terseness and conciseness. He hates waste of words. As a rule, his English words would not outnumber those of his Greek original. And as to conventional sayings, which come out chiefly in rendering the moral or "epimyth," it must be remembered that the tame and often pointless sentiment of the prose morals (nay, sometimes even of the morals of Babrius), is frequently spurious, in addition to being inappropriate. If so, it is justifiable to supply a terse English equivalent for what is borne, in the shape of moral, on the face of the fable. None have any right to quarrel with Mr. Townsend or Mr. James for doing this, provided they do it aptly. Success will sanction the liberty taken. But it must be owned that, if these conventional expressions are a fault, the one writer is as chargeable with it as the other; and the saying about "glass houses" may not need an epimyth, if applied to the later translator. For example, in the fable about the "Farmer and the Stork" (p. 14), the moral of the prose fable is—*καλὸν ἐστὶ φέρειν, καὶ μὴ συγκοινωνεῖν ἀνδράσι κακοῖς, μὴ πως κινδύνους σὺν αὐτοῖς ἐπιέρη*, while Babrius (f. 13) has one which may be thus translated:—

Walk with the bad, and hate will be as strong
'Gainst thee as them, e'en though thou no man wrong.

Any one who recalls the fable, and how in it the farmer ignores the stork's plea for exemption from the fate of the cranes, will see that these fairly represent the moral. Mr. James consults the spirit rather than the letter in his equivalent, "Ill company proves more than fair professions"; but we cannot see that Mr. Townsend steers clearer of conventionalities, or closer to the Greek, when he gives us "Birds of a feather flock together." Another curious case may be cited. In the "Swallow and the Crow" Halm and De Faria differ materially in their Greek. The last sentence of the former is *τὸ δὲ ἴδιον σῶμα καὶ χειρὶν παρατείνεται*. (P.F. 415.) For this last word the latter reads *ἀντιτάσσεται*, and adds the plainly corrupt epimyth *ἡ παράταξις τοῦ σώματος, ἐπιπρεπείας καλλοῦ*; while that of Halm is *ἡ τοῦ σώματος παράταξις ἐπιπρεπείας καλλίων*, which is unmistakably preferable, as implying that "the covering of the body is better than fine show." Few will deny that Mr. James comes nearer this, in his moral, "Durability is better than show," than Mr. Townsend, when he gives for it "Fine weather friends are not worth much." Throughout the book indeed we fancy the latter translator deals with the moral too arbitrarily, whilst upon occasion also he can throw a fair share of "conventional English" into the body of his fable. When, for instance, in the "Farmer and the Cranes," which he takes from Babrius, he renders *φεύγωμεν—ἰς τὰ Πυργίων*, "It is time for us to be off to Liliput," we cannot see why he might not with equal fitness have written "To the land of the Puckwudjies, To the land of little people," and so helped himself out with "Hiawatha," instead of Gulliver's Travels. But here, in departing from literality, he forgets that he is ignoring the ancient myth about the defeat and destruction of the dwarfs of the Upper Nile by the nation of cranes, to which Homer alludes in *Il. III. 6*, and which Aristotle notices in *Hist. An. 8, 12, 3*. This single instance will show the need in translation of heeding the cautious advice "Littus ama," and the danger of so steering as to provoke the question "Quo tandem mihi dexter abis?"

We are far, however, from wishing to convey the impression that this new volume of fables is not on the whole pleasant and readable. Had it not claimed to be literal, it might have had as much right to the prefix of *Æsopian* as most of the Greek prose collections. The "Boasting Traveller," at p. 28, "The Mother and the Wolf," at p. 201, and several fables translated from Phædrus, appear to us to be fully up to the mark. The preface has been carefully prepared, and gives a fair account of fable literature as far as it is known; though it is high time that editors should essay the solution of the problem whether or not the fable is, as Sir G. C. Lewis strove to show, of indigenous Greek origin, and of such collateral questions as how far the Oriental Lokmān is a real character, and not a synonym of *Æsop*. The fables ascribed to him, so far as we can judge of them by a French translation, savour very much of a later copyist, but how far the

meddling work of Planudes has obscured the matter needs deeper study than has yet been given to it. Mr. Thomas Wright, in a *Cornhill* article, strongly asserts the Eastern origin of the fable, and there is an Arab proverb in Burckhart which seemingly refers to the fable of the "Man with Two Sweethearts." Nothing has been done by Mr. Townsend towards solving this question in his preface; with regard to which we cannot but regret that he has suffered Babrius in it to figure as "Babrias," and Avianus as "Avienus," with one or two other not unimportant inaccuracies.

One word more as to the illustrations. They scarcely sustain any claim which Mr. Townsend may put forward for the preference of his version to that of Canon James. In illustrating *Æsop*, Tenniel has observed the proprieties, while in many instances Harrison Weir has not. We invite the reader's sympathy, for instance, for the "kid" which, in p. 47, discourses to a wolf below, from the slanting roof of a painfully modern house; for the trumpeter, also (p. 177) in modern uniform, with a couple of cannon-balls at his feet, about to be put out of his misery by a soldier in equally modern costume; but more than all, for the "Boy Bathing," in p. 147, whom, as he is drowning, a *soi-disant* traveller lectures from a tall jutting cliff, and scolds for his imprudence, "instead of holding out a helping hand." This, as in the illustration he is removed at least twenty yards from the drowning youth, and is nowise habited for taking "a header," would appear to be a work of supererogation. The traveller, it should be added, is attired in a swallow-tail coat, a shovel-hat, breeches, and no gaiters, and to our eye represents a make-up of the pictures of Jemmy Wood the banker and Dominic Sampson. In illustrating the same fable, Tenniel has enough horror of anachronisms to clothe his traveller in an antique tunic and sandals; and if he too puts the traveller far out of reach of the drowning lad, he has this justification, that in Mr. James's version, as indeed in those originals to which we have referred, there is no word about a helping hand, but simply *ἐνὶ βοῇ* *ἴσκι* *ἔκδεται*, or its original English equivalent.

In truth there needs time and thought for turning out a fable-book; and if translators would practise literality, as well as profess it, and if illustrators would work in accord with the translators, in points of costume, scenery, and customs, as regards reproductions of the antique, much vexation and disappointment would be avoided.

LIFE AND OPINIONS OF A FIFTH MONARCHY MAN.*

(Second Notice.)

MONTAIGNE says somewhere that boys ought to be taught to brave pain as part of their education, because a man must reckon as probably upon having sometime or other in his life to undergo judicial torture as on having to suffer the toothache. Such was the sixteenth century in France. In John Rogers's days, it seemed as natural for a religious partisan to expect to be put in prison for his opinions as in ours to be lashed by adverse critics. In the palmy days when he was cheering on Cromwell, he relates a boyish dream which he thought a prophecy of his life. It is a curiously true forecast of his positiveness of opinion and pugnacious disposition; but it shows that, even when he was going with the full tide of success, he looked upon it as his fate to end in prison:—

After seeing a "grave ancient man, full of white hairs like wool, and a long white beard," who told him that he was chosen to preach the word, he goes on with the message. "But after a time thou wilt be troubled with the different opinions and ways of men, and seem at first to be at a loss, but the Lord will be thy guide. Go on, and, as thou goest forward, the way of the Lord will lie clearer and clearer before your eyes; the footsteps are the examples of the saints that have gone before you, which will be a great help unto you, and you shall walk cheerfully on in the way which is clear to you (*than the which you shall see no other*). But yet you must meet the fair house on the left hand—i.e. the glory and great ones of the world, who make a great and fair show to men, are built high; but they must fall, and are but on the left hand of you, whilst you will despise them, preach against them, and turn your eyes, looking forward to go on in the way of God. But the beam that comes out of this great house which makes so much show, is meant the powers and opinions of such, which, whilst somewhat cross to the way, you step aside and will not stoop under, they are set on fire or inflamed of a sudden; but be not troubled, go forward; though they will send after you, saying you have brought this fire upon them, and they will falsely accuse you, and seek to hale you away to prison for this fact." At which I awaked, this being morning, and, being filled with confidence and comfort, I rose up and writ it down presently.

Great part of the book is taken up with Rogers's piteous descriptions of his ill-usage in prison. The Protector shut up the Fifth Monarchy preachers without ceremony, as if they were insane, to keep them out of mischief both to themselves and to the Government. When they complained that it was illegal, and demanded to be brought to trial, "His Highness showed how he kept them from trial out of mercy, because if they were tried the law would take away their lives"; of which, judging from the specimens of their language and threats, we should suppose there could be little doubt. "His work," he said, "was to preserve the people of God from destroying one another, and to keep the godly of several judgments in peace, because like men falling out in the street would run their heads one against another, he was as a Constable to part them and keep them in peace." "I tell you," he says—

"There wants brotherly love, and the several sorts of forms would cut the throats one of another should not I keep the peace."

* *Some Account of the Life and Opinions of a Fifth Monarchy Man, chiefly extracted from the Writings of John Rogers, Preacher.* By the Rev. Edward Rogers, M.A., Student of Christ Church. London: Longmans & Co. 1867.

Ro. "Those you call Fifth Monarchy men are driven by your sword to love one another."

O. P. "Why, I tell you there be Anabaptists (pointing at Mr. Kiffin), and they would cut the throats of them that are not under their forms; so would the Presbyterians cut the throats of them that are not of their forms, and so would you Fifth Monarchy men. It is fit to keep all these forms out of the Power."

A very curious account is given of an interview between Rogers and the Protector. It was drawn up by Rogers's friends, and is meant to exhibit him as triumphantly confounding in argument the tyrant who had him in his power. But the Protector's part in the dialogue is quite in his characteristic manner; and if the report gives Rogers the advantage in argument, it illustrates Cromwell's power of bearing the insolence and audacity of his own side, and his high-mindedness in not taking his revenge. This is a specimen:—

O. P. "You fix the name of Anti-Christian upon anything."

Ro. "Pray, my Lord, make no law against that name; let it not be treason to use the name of Anti-Christian, for that name will up yet higher and higher, and many things that you think good and Christian will be found Anti-Christian ere long."

O. P. (Being angry, looked on his army men). "See" (said he), "and so all is Anti-Christian, and Tithes are so too, with you; but I will prove they are not."

Ro. "My Lord, you were once of another mind, and told me you'd have them pulled down, and put into a treasury."

O. P. "Did I ever say so?"

Ro. "Yea, that you did, in the Cock-pit—the round place there; and said, moreover, that the poor should be maintained, and put to work with what remained of them, that we might have no beggar in England."

O. P. "Ha! there be many gentlemen know that I have been for them, and will maintain the justness of them."

Ro. "But, my Lord, how can that be that the National Ministry is not Anti-Christian?"

O. P. "See now, how you run! It is not a National Ministry that is now established, nor can you make it appear they are Anti-Christian."

Ro. "Yea, my Lord, without any difficulty; out of your own law, which hath constituted these Triers and High-Court Commissioners to establish a worldly clergy."

O. P. "I tell you, you and you, that you cannot, for they ordain none."

Ro. "No; but if the Pope, Prelate, or Devil should ordain them, they must approve of them, settle them in their parishes, and what not, if they be but conformable to"—(He is interrupted).

O. P. "I tell you—I tell you, it is their grace they judge of, and not for parts or learning Latin, Greek, or Hebrew."

Ro. "And who made them judges of grace, my Lord? At most they can but judge of the fruits of grace, and how dare they take upon them to be judges over grace? It is not you, but the Lord Jesus, that can make them such judges." (With that he turned away, as very angry.)

Of course Rogers saw no mercy in being kept from preaching and shut up in a prison, and made the worst of it. He had a faculty in that way. He was like some of the French Republicans under Louis Philippe, part of whose art it was to assume on all occasions, with the most tragic effect, the solemn pose of a victim. He relates how he was interrupted in the middle of his preaching and expounding to appear before the Government Commissioners, and, "from my sweat in that exercise, taken away by the Marshal with my brother Feake to be cooled in the other"; and how he insulted and baffled the instruments of tyranny. Being something of an Orientalist, he heightens his picture of oppression by the apt introduction of barbaresque words and unintelligible scraps of Turkish. "The pragmatical proclivity and activity of the Cavalierish spirit to prosecute and execute the rage of the Beast upon us under the Sword Sovereignty," is, he says, as bad as any Turkish servitude; and he proceeds:—

But to make us in a yet more Turklike slavery . . . behold the Bashaws and Begler-Bey's (i.e. the Major-Generals) sent down to settle their Divans and Militia into every country, with the Timariots also, and Zamiacks or Deputy Bashaws, under them, besides the Janizaries, Gemoglanies, and Spahies or Guards, about the Grand S. at Whitehall. And in the army there are also their Achingies (hinds of the country) or new Militia troops, too, to forage up and down for prey, and to keep the Lord's lambs from meeting and feeding together on Christ's commons. Is not this a new Turkey, then? Let them palliate all as they will with good words, yet, as the proverb is, "Soltan bil adalin kanakirin bila maa" "their Sultan, without justice shall be found like a brook without water"; and neither his soldiers nor multitudes can save him when the time of his judgment is come, "lalah ho-rai," &c.

It was not intended to treat Rogers harshly. In those days gaolers were rough, and prisons inconvenient and unwholesome. But the Government wished to indulge him. They first committed him to the care of a relative, Serjeant Dendy. They let him have, first, his whole family of children and servants with him, and his wife throughout. But he was thoroughly determined to make himself as troublesome and annoying as he could to all about him, that he might have the excuse for complaining of the more severe measures which, in mere self-defence, his keepers were obliged to adopt. He contrived to torment both himself and them in a way in which it is hard to say whether the tragic element or the comic predominates. He insisted on additional room and furniture, and would not pay for it, and protested in the most violent way when he was pressed for it. He insisted on preaching the downfall of the usurping and tyrannical Beast to the soldiers, or to any one within hearing, and shrieked out his lamentations when force was necessary to make him stop. The ingenuity which he displayed in making himself disagreeable to his gaolers must have made their charge heavy to them; and then he revenged himself again by publishing the most piteous tales of their inhuman barbarity. He was one of those people whom we meet with sometimes, who have a sort of talent for making it unpleasant even for the law to deal with them, and who can do so with comparative impunity. Yet suffering is suffering. Even John Rogers is pathetic when he describes the death of his

two children in prison, and how the head-gaoler, whom he would not pay for the use of his furniture, ordered their beds to be taken away when they were dying. Rogers was a fanatical preacher of anarchy, who, if he could, would have raised up the reign of ferocious and merciless madness in England. But it is humiliating to see how easily, and with what thorough conviction and earnestness, the language of madness and fanaticism can ape the noblest accents of heroic suffering in the noblest of causes:—

As Acts xvi. 19, "When they saw that the hope of their gains was gone, they caught Paul and Silas and drew them to the market-place to the rulers, and the rulers cast them into prison" (ver. 23, 24); yea, they were "thrust into the inner prison." But there they sang praises; and so do we our "antelucanos hymnos," and so we will, till the foundations of this earthly government rend. Amen, Hallelujah! Yet I can tell them, that with a better conscience, which is my continual feast, I can look out at these iron bars and sing, whilst the thorn is at my breast to keep me watchful, than they can at their balconies or rattling coaches, or ruffling in their gold and gaudiness, dyed in the blood of saints, and gotten by hypocrisy and cozening. No wonder they are alarmed with continual fears, whilst we poor worms in prison need none of their courts of guard, but can sleep sweetly and securely, though madmen, drunkards, and devils are about us day and night. Thou proudest tyrant, thou canst but batter the vessel, thou canst but hurt the bark; but my life is hid with Christ in God. Amen! and Lord keep it there, that I faint not.

But with all that is pathetic and all that is grotesque, with the resolution and loftiness of spirit which would have made him a hero if he had had but a cause, and with all the volubility and grimaces of a buffoon, there is another element mingled. With all his plaintiveness there is at least the profession of vindictive ferocity. He looks forward to God's vengeance, to be wrought by the hands of the suffering witnesses; and he feeds his confidence of revenge on his interpretations of Daniel and the Apocalypse. The part which miracles have played in the vulgar superstition of Romanism has been replaced in the vulgar superstition of Protestantism by the interpretation of prophecy, ever equally confident and clear, ever ludicrously falsified by the event, ever repeated with unshaken positiveness. Rogers's mainstay in prison was his assurance that he had the key to the Forty-two Weeks, and that they were on the eve of expiring. In a strain of the wildest religious exultation he bids his "concaptives" to be of good cheer. God has "muzzled this misshapen Court monster, this ugly Creature, this Bastard of Ashdod, this seed of the Dragon, begotten in darkness, brought forth in weakness, growing up in wickedness, to be confounded with the fierceness of the wrath of God which is at hand." "I tell you, truly," he goes on, "that after our forty-two month voyage, we may see the land." He bids them be ready, and "wait for the word from on high to fall on, and faith and prayer to do the execution according to Rev. xviii. 6. 'Reward her as she hath rewarded you,' and then by the grace of God, the proudest of them shall know that we are engaged on life and death, with the Lord Jesu our Captain-General on his Red Horse against the Beast's government, so as neither to give nor take quarter, but according to his orders." He bids them be "ready with their Ahod weapon"; to "Beware and Prepare." He warns them that, when the time is come to rise, they must "put off all those relations, though ever so dear, that may make you stagger, yea even stamp upon them"; and quotes St. Jerome for the sentiment that, though father and mother were weeping on his neck or at his knees, he would "run over them all." The time is at hand to "rend up by the very roots the foundations of these persecuting Nimrods with their prisons, so that not one stone be left for a corner of them; yea, till there be such a trembling, shaking, consternation, overturning, and total amotion of them, that the Beast's government may never have a being more in England." And he winds up the following address, first to his friends, and then to the Protector:—

Wherefore because I must break off with these few words to you as to overcomers (for so I trust you are, or will be, in Christ Jesus), and these followers of the Lamb, I shall leave you with that blessed man, Mr. Holland's, legacy bequeathed to his friends at his death against Popery, "Commodo vo dilectioni Dei et odio Papatus," &c. So against this Apostate generation I commend you, my brethren, to the dearest love of God and to the deadliest hatred of these Hypocrites and Apostates. Amen. For (Heb. x. 38) "If any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him."

I would have had a word to this Bastard of Ashdod, this illegitimate monster, had he ears to hear, but his most irrational rage hath hindered me, and I must be silent, with a loud cry to thee, O. P., out of this den, where thou hast cast me so inconsiderately, with such cruelty, and for so long a time too, of whom I think I might have said, as Tacitus of Galba, "Digressus imperandi, nisi imperasset." How worthy hadst thou been of rule, if thou hadst not ruled. But as high as thou art, and as low as I am under thy foot, methinks when I am mounted and winged by the Holy Ghost, thou art as much under me and my Christ whom I serve in these bonds and in this cause. Yea, as *Cirrus Theodorus* said to *Modestus* about *Basil*, when he was under his tyranny, "O *Modestus*, why *Basil* is above thee; thou art but a poor Pismire to him, though thou roarest against him like a Lion," and be not offended at it, for I tell thee through thy cruelty I am set upon a mount so high, as I see thee and all the Kings of the Earth to boot, as proud as they be, but like Hoppinitumbs—I mean but like ants about a molehill, which I laugh at when I see them most busy about their nests, which in one crush will be destroyed, kicked down, and dispersed like the dust on the floor (Dan. ii. 35). Wherefore, sir, that you had but once this sight, and if I speak not to a man most desperately resolved and hardened up to irrevocable destruction, yea, to one worse than a stone, yea, guilty of the great sin against the Holy Ghost, let me be heard. And O that I might be heard in thy conscience, O thou! O thou sinful man! before the decree comes forth, and thy sentence be executed. How sore a rule is running upon thee, though thou see it not! Wherefore either deliver us quickly quit of these dens (admiring our hitherto preservation from on high, whose Angel hath delivered us out of the mouths of these savage beasts), and give you glory to God as *Darius* did, if thou canst find in thy heart so to do, forasmuch as innocence and truth is found on one side, or else I say unto thee by the AUTHORITY of the Lord committed to me, that thou shalt DIE like a BEAST, yea, more miserably than in a DEN or a DUNGEON.

It ought to be added that John Rogers came to no great grief. He was let out of prison shortly after this, and though he still "blew the coals" and was shut up for a short time in the Tower, he kept aloof from the more wild Fifth Monarchy plots. On Cromwell's death he became a prominent member of Sir Harry Vane's party, and waged hot controversy with the Presbyterian Prynne about the "Good Old Cause." The various years which he had fixed upon for the end of all things came, and passed over his head, apparently without surprising him more than similar results surprise Dr. Cumming. He went out of England at the Restoration; but he returned after a certain time, practised physic, taught with milder doctrine a dissenting congregation, advertised infallible preservatives against the plague, and probably died of it in his bed.

CAPTAIN SPENCER'S GERMANY.*

THIS work, as its preface relates, originated in a suggestion of "that eminent caterer for the intellectual requirements of the public, Mr. George Routledge." A book on Germany was wanted "for the million." The million must know "all that can be told in a comprehensive summary of that vast and interesting country of Central Europe which extends from the Baltic to the Adriatic." They must even become "more intimately acquainted with its past history—its probable future"—with the character of the people, and a great many other things besides. Although this encyclopedic design was to be completed within "a month or two" from the date of the demand, such was the author's activity and skill in compression that he duly produced a handsome volume of four hundred widely printed pages, illustrated by several bad lithographs of royal personages, and swelled beyond the dimensions of the original bargain by additional chapters on Hungary, Dalmatia, and the border provinces of Austria and Turkey. That the execution of the work does not lag behind the conception must be at once conceded. What Sir A. Alison has done for history, what Mr. Tupper has done for philosophy and proverbs, that Captain Spencer has done for geography and politics. Subjected to rhythmical rearrangement, his book would form a truly Tupperian compendium of German statistics. But Captain Spencer has positive claims as a discoverer. If he has not, like Columbus, invented a new world, he has detected in the old a thousand circumstances which had hitherto been unsuspected by the superficial eye of earlier observation, native or travelled. With his main position, that humanity has gained by the defeat of Austria and the triumph of Prussia, we are cordially agreed. Only we are a little sceptical in respect of the novelties of fact and illustration, a little impatient of the prolixities and antiquities of reflection, with which he ekes out his worship of the Preussenthum. There never was anything like the civilization, intelligence, good manners, and piety of the Prussians. The King of Prussia has "all the attributes of majesty." His people, as their recent history shows, "are all true Germans, and of every other inhabitant of the fatherland, the least likely to submit to anything approaching to an absolute form of government." Such points have been neglected by the culpable blindness of previous travellers. Not even the most enthusiastic prophets of Geist have risen to the height of the following induction:—"These stern Lutherans have a will of their own, and know how and when to assert it—a fact of which their rulers are perfectly aware." From Captain Spencer's historic reflections we subjoin a pair of pearls taken at random from a whole series. It seems that a jubilee took place at Mariazell "in honour of the important victories obtained by the Empress Maria Theresa over the French and Bavarians at Blenheim." This trifling anachronism must be rather hard to digest, even by "the million." Amongst other jewels of accuracy may be noticed the statement that "Rudolph of Hapsburg inherited the Grand Duchy of Austria," and that the battle of the Marchfeld, where he defeated Ottocar of Bohemia, was fought, not in 1272, but in 1266. After this we are prepared to learn that Frederic the Great was "unsuccessful in his first campaign." Of course "the million" must be treated to a few hints on German literature. Captain Spencer consequently vouchsafes the information that Goethe's "appeal" to the "patriotic feelings" of his countrymen was instrumental in preparing the way for the present movement. Another characteristic of Goethe was his "metaphysical and meditative" mind.

On entering the Prussian dominions Captain Spencer notices the surprising circumstance, unremarked in the history of other nations, that the people have created their own wealth, and turned barren plains into fields and gardens. He adds, "A Prussian most assuredly lives by the sweat of his brow; and herein perhaps lies the secret of that moral and physical ascendancy which she has lately acquired." It is not every traveller who finds out truths like this, or who thus excels in the employment of his pronouns. Captain Spencer sees "sermons in stones," provided the stones be Prussian, and of course he admires the peopled solitudes of Berlin. "Paris itself can scarcely show anything more striking than the famous Unter der (sic) Linden"! If you stand beneath the portico of the Museum, "it is impossible not to be impressed in so doing with a sense of the greatness and power of Prussia." Captain Spencer has been very fortunate in his acquaintance with "the better classes" of Prussians, and has even discovered facts which have eluded the vision of the beloved Berliners themselves. He finds that "men of genius" are ad-

mitted into good society, where he thinks that the general tone, "while sufficiently vivacious and agreeable, is decidedly somewhat learned." But he goes deeper into his moral consciousness than that. It seems that although Swabian matrons are satisfied with mere private indulgence in sentimental syncretism, Prussian ladies insist on publicly postulating the subjectivity of the conditioned and the fundamental antitheses of the *Non ego*. Nor should it be forgotten that Prussians have a deep reverence "for art and literature," and withal "much of the vivacity and enthusiasm of the French"! We commend these accurate pictures to persons who have brought away from Berlin notions of another sort. Prussia is a charming country to live in, especially for natives. Captain Spencer gives a glowing portraiture of the delightful regularity with which the Executive works, so as to reduce every Prussian to be a unit of an organized system. No Prussian ever gets his food adulterated, or is cheated by hotel-keepers, or is bullied or insulted by railway officials, or ever loses anything on a journey. And, as a people, the Prussians are remarkable for "habits of good-breeding and refinement."

Captain Spencer favours us with many casual disquisitions on the late war, giving, as axioms, a series of assertions of which the majority have the merit of being at least strictly original. For instance, in spite of the detailed evidence to the contrary given in Lieutenant Hozier's correspondence, in the Prussian newspapers, and elsewhere, he tells us that the Prussian commissariat and surgical staff left little to be desired. In one page we read that the Austrian fortresses were "occupied as soon as captured"; in the next page, that the Prussians did not lose time "in capturing the enemy's fortresses," but merely masked them; further on, however, we learn that the fortresses of Brunn and Prague (which are open towns) saved Vienna from capture after Königgrätz. We are likewise told that the engagement at Nachod "led to" that of Trautenuau—a connexion not hitherto suspected by the Prussians themselves, and suggestive of the ancient tie between Tenterden Steeple and the Goodwin Sands. Very valuable is the idea that the false rumour of an Austrian victory at Trautenuau led to the battle of Langensalza, especially as we read in a subsequent page that the two actions were fought on the same day. The author appears to think that Langensalza was a triumph to the Prussian arms, for he calls it a battle "in which the Hanoverians were so terribly cut up." Now it is true that Langensalza was followed by the capitulation of the Hanoverians; but this was a moral rather than a military result. Such at least was the opinion of a tolerably good authority, the King of Prussia, who, in addressing a Hanoverian deputation, frankly spoke of the battle in question as one "in which I do not say that I was victorious." If the report of an engagement at Trautenuau flew across Germany in time to affect the courage and operations of the Hanoverian corps, the fact would be a most remarkable one. Such a phenomenon would indeed be a curious parallel to the fact, as related by the ancients, of the news of the victory of Plataea having been transmitted on the same day to Asia Minor so as to contribute to the simultaneous Greek victory of Mycale. Of the campaign in general an account is given about as full and precise as most persons who followed it with their newspapers could give *vis à voce*, without putting too great a strain on their memories. Captain Spencer thinks that the field of Königgrätz was admirably chosen, defended with all the skill that engineering and strategy could suggest, and, in fine, that no proper precaution was neglected. Now it is the unanimous opinion of all competent authorities, Austrians and foreign, that the selection of the banks of the Bistritz for a defensive action was an error. The position had one flank entirely in the air, a rapid river ran in its immediate rear, and the lines of retreat did not run at convenient angles from the Austrian front. Moreover the defences were ill-arranged and unfinished, Chlum, the key of the whole, having been neglected. In consideration of the fact that a solution of a problem which pleases half of "a million" of readers may not chance to please the other half, Captain Spencer likes to offer, as we have already seen, two alternatives. Like the Latin grammar example, he says, "utrum horum navis accipe." He remarks, in regard to Königgrätz—(1) Austria need not blush for her defeat; "her troops sustained their traditional reputation. The gaps in their ranks were quickly filled up, and they everywhere presented a bold front to the enemy" as long as it was any use to do so; in fact, "they only gave way when they were fairly outflanked and beaten." This opinion is afterwards confirmed by a letter from an Austrian staff-officer, who says that "never before, not even on the plains of Lombardy, when we measured swords with the French, did our poor fellows fight with more determination." Nevertheless we are, in a later page, treated (2.) to this question—"Can we then wonder that almost immediately after the first gun was fired on the field of Sadova, the disaffected Italians, Magyars, Croats, Czechs, and Poles, of which the army in Bohemia was chiefly composed, should have laid down their arms and gone over to the enemy in thousands?" A future Colenso may divine a double authorship in such passages and analyse the whole book into its separate Elohist and Jehovistic elements. In a review of Mr. Dicey's recent work our opinion was expressed that there are small grounds for questioning the general good behaviour of the Austrian troops. We also disposed of the allegation, urged with great wealth of ethnological phraseology by Captain Spencer, that "the broad-shouldered sturdy Germans of Upper and Lower Austria," &c. &c. &c., were sent to Venetia. We turn, therefore, to a philosophical deduction of our author's in regard to the battle of Custozza. The

* Germany, from the Baltic to the Adriatic; or Prussia, Austria, and Venetia, with Reference to the late War. By Captain Spencer. With Illustrations. London: George Routledge & Sons. 1867.

news of the victory (June 24), he thinks, arrived opportunely in Vienna, acting as a counter-irritant to a population goaded to the edge of insurrection (!) by the news of the subsequent reverses in Bohemia (June 27—July 3). Some of Captain Spencer's inferences from the issue of the war in Bohemia are as invaluable as his notion that the flight to Olmütz was a "clever flank march." He tells us, in the words of the Austrian staff-officer, how Benedek's maxim at the battle of Königgratz was, "Hold your fire to the last moment, and charge up with the bayonet." Looking to the observed results of this doctrine, our author thinks that we shall all soon return to a more primitive style of fighting. He remarks, "We believe it will be found the best policy to close with the enemy as soon as possible, and that a rush in with the bayonet will be admitted to be the most effectual means of counteracting the influence of the needle-gun and rifled cannon." That is to say, he advises the employment of the particular tactics which were tried by the Austrians with such fatal results, and which it is the function of breechloaders to prevent. In the same way he thinks that distant firing at sea will prove to be a mere game at bowls, and that our old salts will quickly lay their ships alongside the enemy. Not that such inquiries are of any interest in regard to the German war. For Prussia did not win by needle-guns, or even by generalship and *geist*. She "stood forth the champion, not only of German unity, but of religious toleration." "This was the real secret of her strength, and enabled her to triumph so completely over both Austria and the Bund." How different from Austria, who, according to Captain Spencer, "lost the precious moments that should have been devoted to action, in putting up prayers to the Madonna and all the saints and angels in the papal calendar." We should be glad to know the facts to which reference is here so circumstantially made.

Captain Spencer's scheme embraces what we take to be the outline of a sketch of the Italian campaign. He does not know that Medici commanded a division of the regular Italian army, but gives him a post under Garibaldi. As before said, he thinks that the Austrian army at Custoza was composed of "big brawny Germans." From his hedging method it is hard to discover his opinion about that battle. "A large portion of the Italian army" "threw down their arms and fled for their lives." The "big brawny Germans" "soon made" for themselves a clear field. Yet we may not say "that the Italians did not stand well to their arms, especially since the Archduke Albrecht declared in his despatches that they fought 'unendlich tapfer.'" There can be no doubt that this phrase conveys a correct notion of the Archduke's opinion of the bravery of the Italians, but it is unusual for official documents to be couched in a style that approximates to slang. As a matter of fact, we do not detect those words in the despatches in question, and we presume that they may have entered into a private communication from H. I. H. to Captain Spencer. What follows is an average specimen of the author's style, and may serve as a sample of his narrative accuracy, and of the close reasoning which pervades his composition. He speaks of the battle of Custoza:—

Still no one can read these despatches, or the cautiously-worded bulletins of Victor Emmanuel, without perceiving that the Italian army, from the commencement of hostilities with the Austrians, sustained very severe reverses, which ended in a complete rout, when they were cut down without mercy, as is always the case when men throw down their arms and run for their lives.

The last statement is, we should think, perfectly unassailable. But a vulgar mind would suppose that such a paragraph fits the description, not of a battle, but of a campaign. "Hostilities" and "severe reverses" belong, not to a single action, but to a series of movements. As a matter of evidence it is worth remembering that the Archduke Albrecht was unaware of any "severe reverses" sustained by the Italians at the beginning of the battle. His Imperial Highness intimated that up to the afternoon his troops had gained no great success, and that it was only by a desperate final attack that he succeeded in carrying the key of the position before dark.

We cannot follow Captain Spencer through the complications of Hungarian and Illyrian politics. From his discursive and balancing forms of statement and argument, a reader unacquainted with the affairs of those remote parts will gather instruction at least equal in quality to that of which specimens have been given above. Whoever risks his previous knowledge by a perusal of the chapters in question will rise from the study with ideas darkened, memory clouded, and a feeling that his interest in the subject has received a heavy damper.

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

AS an education somewhat more than elementary, and a real taste for reading, are much more widely diffused in America—especially in the North and North-west—than in England, we might reasonably have expected that the number of original works produced among a population already a little outnumbering our own would not have fallen very far short of that of English publications. That the contrary is the case, that the contribution of America to the literature of our common tongue is comparatively trifling, is not, we think, to be ascribed to any lack of leisure or literary ambition among the more cultivated class. Though hereditary fortunes are almost unknown, and large estates rare, it is

said that the proportion of men of leisure and moderate means is not much less in the older States, at least of the North, than in England, and the class of professional writers is very numerous. It is true that newspapers and periodicals fill a larger space in American literature than in our own, and occupy a more considerable share of the attention of the general reader, as might naturally be expected in a country where all men are politicians; and also that authors who in this country would rarely engage in journalism—poets, antiquaries, and historians—figure in the States as editors of leading newspapers, or are largely paid for contributions which we should hardly think adapted to the columns of a daily paper. But this is probably an effect rather than a cause of the scarcity of original American books; men whose natural inclinations would lead them to independent authorship turn to journalism because they find it difficult to attain anything like equal influence or remuneration in any other way. That which Mr. J. S. Mill has said of England, that a man can hardly hope to influence his generation except as a member of Parliament or the editor of a London journal—of the injustice of which remark he is himself a striking example—is in a much greater measure true of America. Few American authors, we believe, make by their books anything corresponding to the sums which are received by popular English writers; and it would be difficult to name a single man in the States whose independent writings have exercised such an influence on American thought as is produced by politicians, preachers, and journalists, or by many leading English writers in different departments of literature. The cause of this difference is probably to be sought, almost exclusively, in that extensive piracy of English books which forms so large a portion of the book trade of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. The market is glutted, the mind of the people is preoccupied, with English reprints; the literary taste of America is formed and its thought moulded by the writers of the Mother-country; and the growth of a distinctive national literature among a nation whose intelligence is as active, whose peculiar bent is as marked, which has as definite and singular an individuality as any in the world, has thus been hitherto almost entirely prevented. There is very little that is American about American books, if we except certain blemishes of style, a certain slovenliness of grammar and clumsiness of expression, derived from the colloquial idioms of the country; and these are wanting in the best American authors. Longfellow, Motley, Prescott, even Washington Irving, are only English writers who happen to publish in America; Poe's eccentricities are rather individual than national; Cooper is American in little but his choice of subjects. It is hardly open to doubt that America has been in every respect the loser by the shortsighted and discreditable policy which has led her to refuse protection to foreign copyright. Of the morality of that policy we need say nothing. There is, indeed, a school which would do away with copyright altogether; and though the injustice of applying the rules of communism to a single species of property, and that the most clearly just and natural of all—a man's property in the produce of his own brain—hardly needs exposure, it would be unfair to charge the advocates of impartial confiscation with wilful dishonesty. But so long as copyright is recognised in native authors, to deny it to foreigners is nothing less than legalized and wholesale robbery. And we fear that the American people, rather than any one class or interest among them, are guilty of this violation of public morality. American authors are anxious for an international copyright, by which they have much to gain and nothing to lose. American publishers are generally of opinion that they gain nothing by the present practice. If one of them pirates an English book, as soon as he has proved its popularity at his own risk, and looks for remuneration for unsuccessful ventures, it is brought out at a lower rate by a competitor; and it would answer better to pay honestly for a property which he could retain than to steal what is sure, if worth stealing, to be stolen from him again. England is notoriously ready to urge a treaty of copyright, the moment there is any chance of its fair consideration. But the American Congress, and those who elect it, fancy that they get English books on better terms by refusing to pay for them, and decline to renounce the advantage derived from the cheapness of stolen goods. It has been asserted of late by experienced American publishers that this is an error; that the uncertainty of profit under the present system enhances the cost by more than the amount of an author's remuneration; and that, though some very cheap pirated editions may be sold under the existing practice, the average price of English books is higher than it would be if the first publisher, paying for and securing the copyright, could rely for his remuneration on the whole number of copies to be sold through the length and breadth of the Union, instead of, as now, being forced to extort an exorbitant profit from the small edition which he may be able to sell before a cheaper competitor appears. If Congress can be persuaded of this—though its present economical ideas give little hope of such a conversion—a concession refused to justice may possibly be yielded to expediency.

The Civil War exercised for several years a depressing influence on the publishing trade of the States; and since its termination the revival has been hampered by the enormous taxation imposed on raw materials, which would, it is said, render it cheaper to print and complete the whole edition of a work in England, and convey it for sale to New York, than to incur the cost of producing it there with imported materials. Nevertheless the number of American works now before us is very considerable; and, as is generally the case, the style of printing and getting up is highly creditable to American taste and enterprise. In some cases,

indeed, the type is too thin and too close; but even in these the goodness of the paper, the neatness of execution, and the freedom from those blemishes which are common in English works of corresponding cheapness are noticeable; while many of the volumes before us leave nothing to be desired in respect of execution.

Two works by Mr. William Rounseville Alger, of very diverse characters, but each displaying an unusual amount of study and great and conscientious painstaking, are first on our list. The history of the *Doctrine of a Future Life**, in different ages and among different nations, is a subject of profound interest, a good and complete account of which has hitherto been, so far as we know, a desideratum in the literature of natural theology. Mr. Alger is well fitted for the task he has undertaken, which is performed in a most liberal spirit, with less of controversial zeal and less bitterness of temper than are often found among theological writers of whatever school, and with that reverence of thought and language which befits a topic so deeply affecting the highest aspirations and strongest feelings of human nature. He discusses, at greater length than some readers will think necessary, various abstract theories regarding death, life, and immortality, and devotes considerable space to propositions which are hardly of historical interest, and in regard to which the minds of those who entertain or who reject them are not likely to be affected by a treatise of this kind. But the properly historical portion of his work is very full, very laborious, and very interesting. It includes a comprehensive survey of the ideas on the subject of the soul's future condition and habitation entertained by the most savage and the most civilized nations, by priests and philosophers, by students and by savages, by the dreamers of the East and the preachers of the West; together with notices of the differences between the belief of the vulgar and the esoteric faith of the educated few in heathen lands. It enters into a detailed disquisition on the notions entertained by Etruscans, Greeks, Romans, Hebrews, Brahmans, Buddhists, and Egyptians, by the successors of the Apostles, by Mahomet, by the mediæval Church, by Luther, and by modern Protestants; and on that gradual development of the doctrine of retribution as an essential feature of the future existence, which is common to the history of the creeds of most nations of the progress of whose opinions we have any distinct record. Of the peculiar doctrines of Buddhism a very full and careful account is given, with especial reference to the crowning state of bliss, Nirvana, which has been commonly supposed to be almost identical with that annihilation from which the instinct of Western races most violently recoils. In Mr. Alger's view, this is a misconception. The idea of Nirvana must be taken in connexion with the whole theory of Buddhism, which regards individuality—separation from the supreme or universal Existence, entailing incarnation, transmigration, and suffering—as the state of evil from which the soul seeks to escape; and a return to that Existence, releasing it from all further liability to the perils and trials of individual or embodied life, but not annihilating its essence or its powers, as the highest and only permanent happiness, to be attained, not by practical virtue, but by contemplative wisdom. The whole notion is essentially Eastern, and probably no effort can make it entirely comprehensible to English minds. In the majority of nations, the first idea of futurity appears to have been something like that expressed in Homer—a gloomy, unreal, inactive, unhappy existence in a world of dreams or shadows, which must have tended rather to deepen than to mitigate the horror of death. Such was, according to Mr. Alger, the *Sheol* of the Hebrews—a vast dusky cavern inside the earth, “the pit” of our translation of the *Psalms*—as well as the *Hades* of the early Greeks, and the realm of *Hela* in Scandinavian mythology. The next development of the idea is visible in the Egyptian sculptures, in Pindar, and in many of the later poets and philosophers of Greece and Rome—a *Hades* divided into a place of torment and a place of happiness; opinions differing as to whether the spirits of the departed remained for ever in their appointed abode, or were to return after hundreds of years to undergo again an earthly probation. Along with this belief, which was that of the multitude in Greece, in Italy, and in Egypt, and much resembles that of the nobler races of savage or semi-civilized countries, existed the esoteric teaching of the *Mysteries*—founded on the old nature-worship that some suppose to have been the basis of all polytheistic systems—which enforced the belief in a resurrection by an appeal to natural analogies, and carried the postulant through scenes dramatically representing the unseen journey of the departed soul. One or other of these different types of opinion, however varied in form or circumstance, would appear to have been accepted by nearly every race, ancient or modern, not acquainted with Christianity or Mahomedanism; an entire absence of belief in the immortality of the soul being, as the author seems to think, nowhere to be found. Some readers may be inclined to question this absolute universality of the doctrine, and in some instances Mr. Alger's account of the creed of a particular nation, or of the meaning of certain ceremonies, may seem to rest on insufficient or fanciful grounds; his narrative of the gradual development and different forms of the doctrine among Christian sects and churches will not pass unchallenged; but, on the whole, the value of the work, as filling creditably a vacant place in the history of opinion, until superseded by more minute inquiry and profounder criticism,

will be generally admitted. Mr. Alger's second and smaller volume* is a collection of translated fragments from Oriental poetry—proverbs, riddles, ballads, legends, and brief parables—with an interesting prefatory criticism on some of the peculiar features and characteristics of Eastern poetry. Whatever their merits as translations, most of the specimens are agreeable in themselves—striking or quaint or graceful ideas vigorously and elegantly rendered.

A new edition of Mr. Leland's translation of *Heine's Pictures of Travel*† deserves to be mentioned. We remember to have seen other translations of the poetical portion of this charming and favourite book, and to have been forcibly struck with their great inferiority, both in elegance and terseness, to Mr. Leland's work, which is marked by very few of the common defects of translated poetry. The present edition is clearly printed, though in close type, and on excellent paper.

Among the best works which issue from the American press are books on American geography—narratives of travel, records of exploring and scientific expeditions, and accounts of the agricultural and commercial resources, the geology, climate, flora and fauna of the different countries of the New World. Many of these are written by public officers, sent out, at the charge of the Federal Government, to obtain a complete account of the various half-known or unknown regions of the Western Continent; others are the work of individual citizens, whose energy and public spirit, with that love of adventure which is perhaps even stronger in Americans than in Englishmen, impel them to similar exertions. One of the most interesting books of travel we have read for many years, after the narratives of the Nilotic explorers, was published as a Federal “blue-book”—the Report of an expedition sent to trace the course of the Colorado river, and ascertain its capabilities of steamboat navigation and the character of the country. Almost equally interesting is Captain Page's narrative‡ of his voyage in the steamer *Waterwitch*—one of the vessels of the Federal squadron in the South Atlantic—up the Parana and Paraguay. Though frequently delayed by the political troubles and chronic civil wars of the countries of La Plata, and more than once impeded by the jealousy or hostility of the ruling Powers, and especially of the despotic and suspicious Government of Paraguay, the expedition succeeded in penetrating into the interior of South America for a distance of a thousand miles in a direct line from the mouth of the river—a voyage doubled in length by the windings of the stream—and in exploring completely the course of this great water-road of the Southern Continent, with some parts of its principal tributaries. The volume contains a quantity of valuable information regarding the condition of the regions explored, their resources, their capabilities for settlement and commerce, their produce and their climate, as well as supplementary sketches of their history and politics. Captain Page evidently entertains a very high opinion of the attractions which, under a better government, these countries might offer to settlers, and of the contribution which they are capable of making to the general wealth of the world. Since the close of the expedition in 1856, the policy of the Riverine Governments has been materially improved, their jealous vigilance relaxed, and the greater part of their waters thrown open to foreign commerce. A very large map is appended to the volume; but it serves principally to show how very little of the vast area of South America has been explored, and what enormous tracts of presumably fertile land are as yet, not only unoccupied, but even unknown.

Under the unpretending title of a *Descriptive Handbook of America*§ we find an elaborate account of the natural features and material development of the States, and of Canada, embracing almost all that the traveller, the merchant, the emigrant, or the statesman would seek to learn from books. The work treats of the geological conformation of the country, the local peculiarities of soil, climate, and temperature in each of the regions into which it is naturally divided; their mineral wealth, what it is, and how distributed; the agricultural products, manufactures, and trade of the various States; those public institutions and remarkable natural objects which an intelligent visitor would desire to see, and the characteristics which would determine the choice of a settler. It gives, besides, the fullest statistics of every kind—agricultural, commercial, and political; the quantities of cotton, sugar, rice, corn, hay, &c., produced; the various manufactures, their amounts and values; exports and imports, tariffs and excise; tables of wages, of population, of employments; schools and charities, and the numbers of their attendants—all, in fact, that figures can tell of the moral and material condition of the country.

* *The Poetry of the Orient*. By William Rounseville Alger. Boston: Roberts Brothers. London: Trübner. 1866.

† *Heine's Pictures of Travel*. Translated by Charles Godfrey Leland. Author of “Meister Carl's Sketchbook,” &c. Fifth Edition. New York: Leypoldt & Holt. London: Trübner & Co. 1866.

‡ *La Plata: the Argentine Confederation and Paraguay*. Being a Narrative of the Exploration of the Tributaries of the River La Plata and adjacent Countries during the years 1853-4-5-6, under orders of the U.S. Government. By Thomas J. Page, U.S.N., Commander of the Expedition. With Map and numerous Engravings. New York: Harper & Brothers. London: Trübner & Co. 1866.

§ *Bacon's Descriptive Handbook of America; comprising History, Geography, Agriculture, Manufactures, Commerce, Railways, Mining, Finance, Government, Politics, Education, Religion, Characteristics, Public Lands, Laws, &c.* By George Washington Bacon, F.R.G.S., and W. George Larkins, R.A. London and New York: G. W. Bacon & Co. 1867.

* *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life; with a complete Bibliography of the Subject*. By William Rounseville Alger. Fourth Edition. New York: W. J. Widdleton. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Co. 1866.

Harper's Handbook for Travellers in Europe and the East*, on the other hand, is a sort of American Murray, hardly likely to relieve its readers from the necessity of providing themselves with the well-known red volumes.

Mr. Whitmore's *Elements of Heraldry*† is, what its title expresses, a brief but sufficient elementary treatise on a subject which Republican manners have not deprived of its interest for our Transatlantic relatives. The author finds it necessary to warn his readers that identity of name gives no warranty for the assumption of a coat-of-arms, and that such assumption implies a pretension to descent from the original bearer of the blazonry. As no Herald's College exists in America, armorial bearings can only be claimed by the descendants of those who are known to have used them in the colonial period; and a number of colonial coats-of-arms—frequently, however, imperfectly known from monuments on which the tinctures are undistinguished—are given as illustrations.

The Civil War is of course still the subject of a number of books of greater or less pretensions. The most important of these is the ninth volume of Putnam's Record of the Rebellion‡, containing, in some 750 closely-printed pages, a great multitude of military reports of various dates and subjects, of which the principal are those relating to Sherman's final campaign. Besides this undigested but valuable mass of historical materials, we have a *Narrative of Andersonville*§, gathered from the evidence taken on the trial of Captain Wirz before the Military Commission, the preface to which affords such evidence of the writer's temper as casts a doubt on his fairness calculated seriously to impair the value of his work; and *Four Years in the Saddle*||, by Colonel Harry Gilmore, one of the most dashing irregular officers of cavalry in the Confederate service. *Adrift in Dixie*¶ is the story of a Yankee officer's imprisonment and escape. The *New Gospel of Peace*** is a clever satire on the Peace party during the war, and on the Radicals of the present day, which has nothing so exceptional about it as its title and its travesty of Scriptural style and arrangement, its language and substance being perfectly free from the irreverence which the title-page suggests. The *Sanctuary*††, a *Tale of the Civil War*, requires no especial notice.

* *Harper's Handbook for Travellers in Europe and the East*. By W. Pembroke Petridge. Fifth Year. New York: Harper & Brothers. Paris: Galignani. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Co. 1867.

† *The Elements of Heraldry; containing an Explanation of the Principles of the Science, and a Glossary of the Technical Terms employed, with an Essay upon the Use of Coat-Armour in the United States*. By W. H. Whitmore. New York: W. J. Middleton. London: Trübner & Co. 1866.

‡ *The Rebellion Record*. A Diary of American Events. With Documents, Narratives, Illustrative Incidents, &c. Edited by Frank Moore. Vol. IX. New York: D. van Nostrand. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Co. 1866.

§ *A Narrative of Andersonville; drawn from the Evidence elicited on the Trial of Henry Wirz, the Jailor*. With the Argument of Colonel N. P. Chipman, Judge-Advocate. By Ambrose Spencer. New York: Harper & Brothers. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Co. 1866.

|| *Four Years in the Saddle*. By Colonel Harry Gilmore. New York: Harper & Brothers. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Co. 1866.

¶ *Adrift in Dixie; or, a Yankee Officer among the Rebels*. With an Introduction by Edmund Kirke, Author of "Among the Pines," &c. &c. New York: Carleton. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Co. 1866.

** *The New Gospel of Peace, according to St. Benjamin*. New York: The American News Company. London: Trübner & Co. 1866.

†† *The Sanctuary*. A Story of the Civil War. By George Ward Nichols; Author of "The Story of the Great March." London: Sampson Low, Son, & Co.

We have received a letter from Mr. BREWER, with reference to the Greek Professorship at Oxford, in which he states that the discovery of the documents furnished from the Record Office was due exclusively to himself, and not to Mr. ELTON. In justice to Mr. BREWER we give the following extract from his letter:—

"When the Professor's endowment was last under discussion, Mr. Wright of Oriel, then lecturing for Professor Pearson at King's College, asked me if I could furnish him with any documents bearing on this disputed question. I took Mr. Wright to my office in the Rolls, showed him the documents which appeared to me to bear upon the case, and, as he was unable to read the handwritings, some of the documents I translated to him, and of others I gave him the substance. Mr. Wright was so much struck with the result that he asked my leave to call in Mr. Elton, and a few days after, in the same room in which I now write these lines, I either read to Mr. Elton the documents verbally, or gave him abstracts of them orally, as I had done before to Mr. Wright. Mr. Elton sitting by, and putting down on paper whatever he thought advisable."

NOTICE.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any News-agent, on the day of publication.

Nearly all the back Numbers of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained through any Bookseller, or at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, W.C.

Cloth Cases for Binding all the Volumes may be had at the Office, price 2s. each. Also, Reading Cases, price 2s. 6d. each.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

MONDAY POPULAR CONCERTS, St. James's Hall.—

MORNING PERFORMANCE, on Saturday next, March 2, at Three o'clock. Executants: Madame Schumann, M.M. Joachim, L. Rie, Henry Blagrove, Zerbini, and Violoncello; Miss Edith Wynne. Conductor, Mr. Benedict. Sofa Suite, 1s.; Balcony, 2s.; Admission, 1s.—Tickets and Programmes at Chappell & Co.'s, 50 New Bond Street.

MR. HENRY LESLIE'S CHOIR, St. James's Hall.—

Thursday, February 28.—Madrigals and Part Songs; Mendelssohn's Psalm, "Why Rage the Heavens?" Solists: Miss Edith Wynne and Miss Madeline Schiller.—Tickets, 6s., 3s., 1s.; of J. Cook & Addison, 43 New Bond Street; Keith, Frouse, & Co., 48 Chesham; and Austin's Ticket Office, St. James's Hall.

PHILHARMONIC SOCIETY.—FIRST CONCERT, March

the 11th.—Queen's Concert Rooms, Hanover Square. Conductor, Mr. W. G. Cusack. Solists: Herr Joachim, Miss Louise Fyfe, and Mr. W. H. Cummings. Subscription, Four Guinea; Family ditto, Three and a Half Guinea; Single Tickets, 1s. At J. Cook & Addison, & Co.'s, 43 New Bond Street.

By Order, STANLEY LUCAS, Secretary.

SOCIETY OF PAINTERS IN WATER-COLOURS.—The

WINTER EXHIBITION OF SKETCHES AND STUDIES by the MEMBERS is NOW OPEN, 5 Pall Mall East. Ten till Five.—Admission, 1s. WILLIAM CALLOW, Secretary.

INSTITUTE OF PAINTERS in WATER-COLOURS.—

EXHIBITION OF SKETCHES AND STUDIES Open from Ten till Six at their Gallery, 50 Pall Mall, opposite Marlborough House.—Admission, 1s.; Catalogue, 6d. Gas light at Desk. JAS. FAHEY, Secretary.

THE AZTECS.—SEÑOR and SEÑORA NUNEZ, who were

Married, in the presence of the Registrar-General and Family, &c., on Monday, the 7th day of January, 1867, in the Parish of St. George, Hanover Square, and were afterwards entertained at a Wedding Breakfast at Willis's Rooms, at which were present several of the Nobility and other Distinguished Persons, had the honour of appearing before Her Majesty, the late Prince Consort, the Prince of Wales, and the other Members of the Royal Family, at Buckingham Palace, on the 4th day of July, 1863. The gratification they imparted to the Royal Party was rewarded by several Presents, and a Cheque on Messrs. Coutts & Co. for a Maudslough Sum. Since 1863 they have appeared before the Emperor Napoleon and Imperial Family at the Tuileries; the Emperor and Imperial Family of Austria; the Emperor and Imperial Family of Russia; the Kings and Queens of Prussia, Bavaria, Holland, Hanover, and Denmark; King of Belgium; Count de Flandre; Duchess of Brabant, and a Million Visitors. MAXIMO and BARTOLA were the Guests of President Fillmore and Family at the White House at Washington, on the 11th day of June, 1865; and afterwards were presented to all the Members of the American Senate and House of Representatives. The mystery connected with their History, their Origin, and their Tribe is as great a puzzle as ever to the scientific men of Europe and America. They are unlike anything yet seen, and, as Professor Owen says, "cannot fail to surprise and gratify all beholders." The Aztecs, MAXIMO and BARTOLA, will receive Visitors, for a short time only, prior to their departure for Italy, at the HANOVER SQUARE ROOMS. Commencing on Saturday, 23rd day of February, 1867. Grand Fashionable Reception (Morning) Daily from One till Three. Entrance, 2s.; Children, 1s. 6d. Evening Reception, from Three till Five. Entrance, 2s. 6d.; Children, 1s. 6d. Photographs of the Aztecs, in their Wedding and other Dresses, each 1s.; Historic, 1s.

INSTITUTION of NAVAL ARCHITECTS.

NOTICE.

THE EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING of the INSTITUTION of NAVAL ARCHITECTS will take place at Twelve o'clock, on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, the 11th, 12th, and 13th of April next, at the Hall of the Society of Arts, John Street, Adelphi, London. There will also be EVENING MEETINGS on Thursday and Friday, at Seven o'clock.

Papers on the Principles of Naval Construction, on Practice of Shipbuilding, on Steam Navigation, on the Equipment and Management of Ships for Merchant Service and for War, will be read at this Meeting.

Naval Architects, Shipbuilders, Naval Officers of the Royal and Merchant Services, and Engineers, who propose to read Papers before the Institution, are requested immediately to send in their Papers, with illustrative Drawings, to the Secretary.

Candidates for admission as Members or as Associates are requested to send in their applications immediately. The Annual Subscription of £2 2s. is payable on admission, and becomes due at the commencement of each succeeding year.

* * * Volume VII. of the "TRANSACTIONS," containing a Nominal and General Index to the Seven Volumes, is now complete, and in course of delivery to the Members and Associates.

7 Adelphi Terrace, London, W.C. CHARLES CAMPBELL, Assistant Secretary.

THE VERULAM TUTORIAL INSTITUTE,

Established to prepare CANDIDATES for the Indian and Home Civil Service. A Staff of Sixteen Tutors, Graduates of Oxford, Cambridge, and Foreign Universities, and Native Gentlemen of India, under the Direction of F. A. HANBURY, M.A., Queen's Coll. Camb.; and W. H. SPENCER, M.A., Down Coll. Camb. Arrangements for Resident and Non-Resident Students.—Prospectus on application to Mr. SPENCER.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, 43 and 45 Harley Street, W.

Incorporated by Royal Charter, 1853, for the General Education of Ladies, and for granting Certificates of Knowledge.

Patrons. HER MAJESTY the QUEEN. H.R.H. the PRINCESS of WALES. Visitor.—The LORD BISHOP of WESTMINSTER. Principal.—The DEAN of WESTMINSTER.

The HALF TERM for the College and Schools will begin on Thursday the 9th inst.

E. H. PLUMPTRE, M.A., Dean.

BRADFIELD.—ST. ANDREW'S COLLEGE, Bradfield,

near Reading.—Incorporated by Royal Charter. One Exhibition of £50 and one of £25 will be Open in April next to Candidates for admission to this School. For information, apply to the Warden, Rev. THOMAS BRADFIELD, Bradfield, near Reading; or to the Honorary Secretary, J. H. FARRISON, Esq., at his Chambers, 1 Elm Court, Middle Temple, London.

CIVIL SERVICE HALL.—CANDIDATES for the India

Civil Service, the Government Offices, and the Army are prepared for their Examinations at the Civil Service Hall, 12 Princes Square, Haymarket, W., by A. D. SPURGE, M.A., assisted by Graduates in Honours of Oxford, Cambridge, &c.

CIVIL SERVICE and ARMY.—Mr. W. M. LUPTON,

Author of "English History and Arithmetic for the Civil Service and Army Examinations," rapidly and successfully prepares GENTLEMEN for both Services. Highest references.—Address, 14 Beaufort Buildings, Strand.

WOOLWICH, SANDHURST, and the LINE.—A GENTLE-

MAN, whose Pupils have been eminently successful—one passed 2nd at the last Woolwich Examination—receives FOUR PUPILS to prepare for the above.—Address, W. R., 57 Post Office, Barnes, S.W.

INDIAN and HOME CIVIL SERVICE.—Woolwich, Sand-

hurst, and the Line.—CLASSES and PRIVATE PUPILS are prepared in Civil and Mechanical Engineering, Works and Estimates.—Tues. Romulus, C.E., & Westminster Chambers, Victoria Street, S.W., Principal.

INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE, WOOLWICH, SANDHURST,

and the LINE.—Mr. WREN, M.A., Christ's College, Cambridge, assisted by a High (Fifth) Wrangler, an Oxford First-class Classic, and the best Masters obtainable for all the other Subjects allowed to be taken up, receives RESIDENT and NON-RESIDENT PUPILS. References to Parents of numerous successful Pupils. Moderate terms.—Wiltshire House, St. John's Road, Brixton, S.

WOOLWICH, SANDHURST, the LINE, and the UNI-

VERSITIES.—EIGHT PUPILS are prepared for the above by the Rev. G. R. ROBERTS, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, and late Professor in the R. L. M. College, Adelaide.—Address, The Limes, Croydon, S.

NAVAL CADETS.—EASTMAN'S R.N. ACADEMY,

SOUTHEA. At FOUR recent Examinations, SIXTY-THREE PUPILS passed as Naval Cadets. At the last Examination Pupils took Second, Third, Fourth, Sixth, &c. Places.

Applications to be addressed to Dr. SCHWENKEL, as above.

SCHOOL of CHEMISTRY,

10 Great Marlborough Street. Directed by Mr. VACHER.

The LABORATORIES are Open Daily from Ten to Five, for the Study of Analysis. Terms 1s. per Month.

Private Lessons given in the Elements of Chemistry.

TUITION.—The Rev. T. FIELD, B.D., Vicar of Pampesford, Cambridge, formerly Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge, prepares PUPILS for the University or the Competitive Examinations, and has Vacancies at present. Terms at the rate of £200 per annum.

THE INCUMBENT (Married) of a Small College Living in a very healthy and pleasant part of Essex, late Fellow and Lecturer of his College in Cambridge, takes TWO or THREE PUPILS to prepare for the Public Schools, Universities, &c.—Address, Rev. S. V. F. Post Office, Witham, Essex.

A CLERGYMAN, late Tutor of his College, residing in a Country Rectory, has Accommodation for One or TWO YOUNG GENTLEMEN who require a Mathematical Preparation for the University. Liberal terms, and good references.—Apply, by letter or personally, to C. D., 25 Ledbury Road, Baywater, W.

TUTORSHIP WANTED.—An OXFORD GRADUATE wishes to meet with an Engagement as PRIVATE TUTOR in a Gentleman's Family. No objection to Travel.—Address, W. W., care of Blacket & Son, Newbury.

PRIVATE TUTOR.—An M.A. in Orders, Fellow and First-class Classic, has leisure in the Morning for a few PUPILS. The Advertiser has also a competent knowledge of French and German, acquired in the several Countries.—Address, MAGNAN, Horn's Library, Albany Street, N.W.

TO PARENTS and GUARDIANS.—A YOUTH of not less than Seventeen will be taken, Outdoors, for Three Years in an Old-Established and highly lucrative Manufacturing Business, where he will also acquire the duties of the Counting-house. A knowledge of Drawing necessary.—Letters to SANDERS & SONS, 173 Oxford Street.

HOME, &c., for ONE or TWO Young CHILDREN, of good Birth, in a healthy and beautiful Village in Warwickshire.—Address MATTHEW, "Courier" Office, Leamington.

POOR, CLERGY RELIEF SOCIETY. Established 1866. For the immediate Assistance of the Clergy, their Widows and Orphans, in Temporary Distress.

OFFICES: 36 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.
At their Fortnightly Meeting to-day, the Committee have been enabled to make Grants for immediate distribution amounting to £120 to Seventeen Applicants, consisting of the Poor Clergy, and the Widows and Orphans of the Clergy. Very large Grants of Clothing were made at the same time.

Contributions will be thankfully received at the London and Westminster Bank, 1 St. James's Square, W., or at the Society's Offices, 36 Southampton Street, Strand, W.C.
G. THORNTON MOSTYN, M.A., Hon. Sec.
R. TURTLE PIGGOTT, Secretary.

HYDROPATHIC SANATORIUM, SUDBROOK PARK, Richmond Hill, Surrey.—Physician, Dr. EDWARD LANE, M.A., M.D. Edin. Univ.—For the treatment of Chronic Diseases, principally by the combined Natural Agents—Air, Exercise, Water, and Diet. Turkish Baths on the Premises, under Dr. Lane's Medical Direction.

A TEN SHILLING TICKET OF THE CASH PAYMENT ASSOCIATION saves from 10 to 25 per cent. on most Articles of Domestic Expenditure.

The Lists (price 6d. to Ticket-holders) contain many additional Names of First-class Travellers.
Ticket and List sent on receipt of 10s. 6d.
11 Waterloo Place, S.W. F. V. RAINSFORD, Sec.

STAINED GLASS WINDOWS and CHURCH DECORATIONS.
HEATON, BUTLER, & BAYNE,
GARRICK STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON.
Illustrated Catalogue, post free, 3s. 6d.

ECCLIASTICAL and DOMESTIC DECORATION, &c.
HARLAND & FISHER, 33 Southampton Street, Strand, W.C., Ecclesiastical Decorators, &c., and Manufacturers of every description of CHURCH and DOMESTIC MEDIEVAL FURNITURE, Paper Hangings, &c. Designs and Estimates furnished, or an Illustrated Priced Catalogue, upon application. Robes, Surplices, &c.

CHUBB'S PATENT LOCKS and SAFES, with all the latest Improvements. Street-door Latches, Cash and Deed Boxes, Strong-Room Doors.
CHUBB & SON, 37 St. Paul's Churchyard, London; 68 Cross Street, Manchester; 28 Lord Street, Liverpool; and Horseley Fields, Wolverhampton.—Illustrated Price Lists sent free.

NICOLL'S GUINEA WATERPROOF TWEED, and their Two Guinea Melton Cloth Overcoats, are patronized by Travellers all over the World. Ladies' Waterproof Tweed Cloaks, One Guinea.—H. J. & D. NICOLL, 114 to 120 Regent Street; 25 Cornhill, London; 10 Mosley Street, Manchester; and 50 Bold Street, Liverpool.

THOMSON'S "GLOVE-FITTING" CORSETS.—An entirely new principle, with new Spring Fastening. Manufacturers of the "PRIZE MEDAL CRINOLINES."—Trade Mark, a "Crown."

REMOVAL.—STEPHEN SMITH (late SMITH & NICHOLSON), Duke Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, Manufacturer of Silver and Electro Plate, to 25 King Street, Covent Garden (late the Garrick Club House).
N.B.—The Show-Rooms will be closed in future at Two on Saturdays.

EASY CHAIRS, COUCHES, and SOFAS, of the Best Quality, made to any Pattern.—200 different Shapes on View for Selection and Immediate Delivery.—At T. H. FILLMER & SON'S Manufactory, 31, 32, and 28 Berners Street, Oxford Street, W.; 31 and 35 Charles Street, W.—Illustrated Catalogues, post free.

METROPOLITAN RAILWAY—MOORGATE TERMINUS.
NORTH LONDON RAILWAY—LIVERPOOL STREET TERMINUS.

WILLIAM SMEE & SONS, Decorators, Cabinet-Makers, Upholsters, and Bedding Warehousemen, respectfully direct attention to the conveniences now afforded by the above Railways of access to their WAREHOUSES, 6 Finbury Pavement, and 34 Little Moorfields, which are within respectively one and four hundred yards of the Stations.

Residents at the West End of London, and upon the North London, North-Western, Great Northern, Midland, Great Eastern, Great Western, Chatham and Dover, and South Coast lines of Railway generally, can now come to the Finbury Stations in most cases without change of carriage.

WILLIAM SMEE & SONS' Salesmen wait upon intending Purchasers in the above districts, and throughout the country, free of charge, to prepare Estimates, and with Designs of Furniture and Supplies of Materials.

INTENDING PURCHASERS of the SMEE'S SPRING MATTRESS, TUCKER'S PATENT, or SOMMIER TUCKER, are respectfully cautioned against various imitations and infringements, preserving somewhat the appearance of the Original, but wanting all its essential advantages.

Each Genuine Mattress bears the Label "Tucker's Patent," and a Number.
The Smees' Spring Mattress, Tucker's Patent, received the only Prize Medal or Honourable Mention given to Bedding of any description at the International Exhibition, 1862, and may be obtained, price from 25s., of most respectable Bedding Warehousemen and Upholsters, and Wholesale of the Manufacturers.

WILLIAM SMEE & SONS, Finbury, near Moorgate Railway Terminus, London, E.C.

IRON WINE BINS.—The Original Manufacturers, FARROW & JACKSON, Wine and Spirit Merchants' Engineers, Great Tower Street, Mansell Street, and 8 Haymarket, where Cellars may be seen fitted in various ways. French Wine Bins, 12s. per 100 Bottles. Illustrated Priced Catalogues on application. "Nous avons pu visiter leurs magasins de Haymarket, Mansell Street, et Great Tower Street. On y trouve de tout ce qui est indispensable, utile ou luxueux dans le maniement des vins, depuis la cave où on les garde jusqu'à la table où on les boit."—*Journal de Viticulture pratique.*

INK SOLVENT.—This Preparation instantly removes Ink, Ironmould, and Fruit-Stains from all kinds of Linen, Paper, or the Skin, by merely wetting the Stains with the Solvent. For removing Blots it is exceedingly convenient, as it obviates the use of an erasing knife. 1s. per bottle.—Made only by PLESSE & LUBIN, 3 New Bond Street. The Trade Supplied.

W. T. COOPER, PHARMACEUTICAL CHEMIST, 26 Oxford Street, W.

Genuine Drugs, Pure Chemicals.—Competent Assistants.—No Apprentices.
* * Medicines delivered free within a radius of Three Miles.

Prescriptions from the Country despatched same day.
Original Maker of the MEDICATED VAGINAL and UTERINE PESSARIES, as recommended by Dr. T. A. Smees, "Obstetrical Transactions," Vol. IV. p. 203, London, 1863; and inventor of the long SOLUBLE MEDICATED BOUGIES.

CLEAR COMPLEXIONS for all who use the "UNITED SERVICE" SOAP TABLET, which also imparts a delicious Fragrance.—Manufactured by J. C. J. FIELD, Extentor of the SELLER'S LIPIN CANDLES.

Sold by Chemists, Oil and Italian Warehousemen, and others.
* * Use no other. See Name on each Tablet.

UNIVERSITY LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.—Extension to Foundation Schools. Additions in 1866 at the rate of 11 per cent. per annum. 24 Suffolk Street, London, E.W. CHARLES McCABE, Secretary.

Established 1834.
SCOTTISH UNION INSURANCE COMPANY (Fire and Life), 37 CORNHILL, LONDON. Capital, £5,000,000.
Fire and Life Insurances on the most liberal terms and conditions.
Copies of the Annual Report, just issued, may be had on application.

37 Cornhill, London. FREDK. GARLE SMITH, Secretary to the London Board.
IMPERIAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY, 1 OLD BROAD STREET, and 16 and 17 PAULI MALL, LONDON.
Established 1803.

SUBSCRIBED AND INVESTED CAPITAL AND RESERVED FUND, £1,500,000.
LOSSES PAID, £3,000,000.
Fire Insurances granted on every description of Property, at Home and Abroad, at moderate rates.

Claims liberally and promptly settled.
All Policies are now entitled to the recent Reduction in the Duty to 1s. 6d. per cent., whether covering Buildings, Furniture, or Stock.

JAMES HOLLAND, Superintendent.
PROVIDENT LIFE OFFICE, 50 Regent Street, London, W.

ESTABLISHED 1805.
INVESTED CAPITAL, £1,607,235. ANNUAL INCOME, £208,739.
BONUSES DECLARED, £1,451,157.

CLAIMS PAID SINCE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE, £1,048,362.
President—The Right Honourable Earl GREY.

The Profits, subject to a trifling deduction, are divided among the Insured.
THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT SHOWS THE ADVANTAGES YIELDED TO THE POLICY HOLDERS.

Out of £263,195, the amount of Profit upon the recent Division, £20,375 only was apportioned to the Shareholders, and the remaining sum of £242,820 was allotted among the various Policies entitled to Bonus.

The parties insured thus enjoy the advantages of a mutual Society, and are relieved from any liability.

Examples of Bonuses added to Policies issued by the Provident Life Office.

Number of Policy.	Date of Policy.	Annual Premium.	Sum Insured.	Amount with Bonus additions.
4,718	1823	£ s. d. 104 15 10	5,000	£ s. d. 10,632 14 2
3,284	1821	165 4 2	5,000	10,164 19 0
4,637	1824	205 13 4	4,000	9,537 2 2
2,147	1816	122 13 4	4,000	8,576 11 2
3,944	1821	40 15 4	1,000	2,496 7 6
798	1808	29 18 4	1,000	2,357 13 5

The Forms of Proposal for Insurance are prepared with a view of giving the Life Proposed the least possible trouble.

INSURANCES may be effected in any part of the Kingdom by a Letter addressed to the SECRETARY, 50 Regent Street, London, W.

FOUNDED 1836.
LEGAL and GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.
10 FLEET STREET, E.C.

Trustees.
The Rt. Hon. Sir WM. BOVILL, Lord Chief Justice, C.P.
The Rt. Hon. Sir HUGH CAIRNS, Lord Justice.

The Hon. Sir EDWARD VAUGHAN WILLIAMS.
The Hon. Sir WM. PAGE WOOD, Vice-Chancellor.
The Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSE.

EDWARD SMITH BIGG, Esq.
ROBERT B. FOLLETT, Esq., Taxing Master in Chancery.

SECURITY.—Funds invested in the names of the above Trustees exceptionally large in proportion to liabilities. The further guarantee of a fully subscribed Capital of £1,000,000.
BONUS.—Nine-tenths of the total Profits divisible amongst the Assured. Very moderate Non-Bonus Premiums.

A liberal system of "Whole World" Policies and other peculiar facilities. Conditions specially framed to secure to a Policy when once issued absolute freedom from all liability to future question.

Loans granted on Life Interests or Reversions.
E. A. NEWTON, Actuary and Manager.

ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE CORPORATION.
Established A.D. 1720, by Charter of King George I., and confirmed by Special Acts of Parliament.

Chief Office, ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON; Branch, 29 PAULI MALL.
FIRE, LIFE, and MARINE ASSURANCES on liberal terms.

The Duty on Fire Assurances has been reduced to the uniform rate of 1s. 6d. per cent. per annum.
No Charge is made by this Corporation for Fire Policy or Stamp, however small the Assurance may be.

Life Assurances with or without participation in Profits.
Divisions of Profit every Five Years.

Any sum up to £15,000 insurable on the same Life.
The Corporation bear the cost of Policy Stamps and Medical Fees.

A liberal participation in Profits, with the guarantee of a large invested Capital Stock, and exemption, under Royal Charter, from the liabilities of partnership.

The advantages of modern practice, with the security of an Office whose resources have been tested by the experience of nearly a Century and a half.

A Prospectus and Table of Bonus will be forwarded on application.
ROBERT P. STEELE, Secretary.

CLOSE OF THE BOOKS OF
THE SCOTTISH EQUITABLE (MUTUAL) LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.
Established 1831.

THE ASSURANCE LISTS for the Thirty-Sixth Year will be closed on 1st March.
PROPOSALS lodged at the Head Office or any of the Agencies, on or before that date, will obtain the advantage of One Year's Additional Bonus over later Proposals.

Position of the Society at March 1866.
Existing Assurances... £5,356,058
Accumulated Funds... £1,649,720
Annual Revenue... £27,608

The whole Profits belong to the Assured, who are expressly freed from all responsibility.
The Vested Bonus Additions amount to £1,491,800.

Forms of Proposal, and all information, may be obtained at the Head Office or Agencies.
Edinburgh, January 1867. GEORGE TODD, Manager.
LONDON OFFICE, 2 OULTRY. WILLIAM FINLAY, Secretary.

ARCH. T. H. CHAPMAN, Esq., Sec.
BONUS YEAR, 1867.

NATIONAL PROVIDENT INSTITUTION, 48 Gracechurch Street, London, E.C.

Invested Capital, £2,640,200; Annual Income, £403,236.
Profits divided since 1835, £1,527,258.

The next Division of Profits will be made to the 20th November next, and Assurances effected prior to that date will participate.

The new Prospectus, &c. will be forwarded on application.
February 1867. SAMUEL SMILES, Sec.

ACCIDENTS WILL HAPPEN!
Everyone should therefore provide against them!

£1,000 in Case of Death, or 5s. Per Week while Laid up by Injury caused by ACCIDENT OF ANY KIND (Riding, Driving, Hunting, Shooting, Fishing, &c.)

May be Secured by an Annual Payment of from £3 to 26 3s. to the RAILWAY PASSENGERS' ASSURANCE COMPANY.

The oldest established and largest Company in the World insuring against ACCIDENTS OF EVERY DESCRIPTION.
64 CORNHILL, and 10 REGENT STREET, LONDON.

WILLIAM J. VIAN, Secretary.